This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at http://books.google.com/

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY
AH 2215 .
HARVARD DEPOSITORY
BRITTLE BOOK

Digitized by Google

HARVARD
DIVINITY
SCHOOL
Andover-Harvard
Theological Library

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Herbert Danby.
Keble College
Oxford.

Nov. 3rd 1908.

The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF

THE REV. SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER, D.D.,
Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford;

THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D.,
Master of University College, Durham;

AND

THE REV. CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D.,
Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology,
Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

DEUTERONOMY.

REV. S. R. DRIVER, D.D.

Digitized by Google

PRINTED BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

The Rights of Translation and of Reproduction are Reserved.

Digitized by Google

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON DEUTERONOMY.

BY THE

REV. S. R. DRIVER, D.D.,

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD;
FORMERLY FELLOW OF NEW COLLEGE, OXFORD.

THIRD EDITION.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1902.

Digitized by Google

FIRST EDITION	. .	*May 1895.*
SECOND EDITION	. .	*October 1896.*
THIRD EDITION	. .	*January 1902.*

ES
491
.I6
v.5
1902

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

The aim of the present volume (in accordance with the plan of the series, of which it forms part) is to supply the English reader with a Commentary which, so far as the writer's powers permit it, may be abreast of the best scholarship and knowledge of the day. Deuteronomy is one of the most attractive, as it is also one of the most important, books of the Old Testament; and a Commentary which may render even approximate justice to its many-sided contents has for long been a desideratum in English theological literature. Certainly the Hebrew text (except in parts of c. 32. 33) is not, as a rule, difficult; nevertheless, even this has frequently afforded me the opportunity of illustrating delicacies of Hebrew usage, which might escape the attention of some readers. On the other hand, the contents of Deuteronomy call for much explanation and discussion: they raise many difficult and controverted questions; and they afford frequent scope for interesting and sometimes far-reaching inquiry. Deuteronomy stands out conspicuously in the literature of the Old Testament: it has important relations, literary, theological, and historical, with other parts of the Old Testament; it possesses itself a profound moral and spiritual significance; it is an epoch-making expression of the life and feeling of the prophetic nation. I have done my best to give due prominence to these and similar characteristic features; and by pointing out both the spiritual and other factors which Deuteronomy presupposes, and the spiritual and other influences which either originated with it, or received from it a fresh impulse, to define the position which it occupies in the national and religious history of Israel. Deuteronomy, moreover, by many

Digitized by Google

of the observances which it enjoins, bears witness to the fact that Israel's civilization, though permeated by a different spirit from that of other ancient nations, was nevertheless reared upon the same material basis; and much light may often be thrown, both upon the institutions and customs to which it alludes, and upon the manner in which they are treated by the Hebrew legislator, from the archæological researches of recent years. Nor is this all. The study of Deuteronomy carries the reader into the very heart of the critical problems which arise in connexion with the Old Testament. At almost every step, especially in the central, legislative part (c. 12–26), the question of the relation of Deuteronomy to other parts of the Pentateuch forces itself upon the student's attention. In dealing with the passages where this is the case, I have stated the facts as clearly and completely as was possible within the limits of space at my disposal, adding, where necessary, references to authorities who treat them at greater length. As a work of the Mosaic age, Deuteronomy, I must own, though intelligible, *if it stood perfectly alone*,—*i.e.* if the history of Israel had been other than it was,—does not seem to me to be intelligible, when viewed in the light shed upon it by other parts of the Old Testament: a study of it in that light reveals too many features which are inconsistent with such a supposition. The entire secret of its composition, and the full nature of the sources of which its author availed himself, we cannot hope to discover; but enough is clear to show that, however regretfully we may abandon it, the traditional view of its origin and authorship cannot be maintained. The adoption of this verdict of criticism implies no detraction either from the inspired authority of Deuteronomy, or from its ethical and religious value. Deuteronomy marks a stage in the Divine education of the chosen people: but the methods of God's spiritual providence are analogous to those of His natural providence: the revelation of Himself to man was accomplished not once for all, but through many diverse channels (Heb. 1[1]), and by a gradual historical process; and the stage in that process to which Deuteronomy belongs is not the age

Digitized by Google

of Moses, but a later age. Deuteronomy gathers up the spiritual lessons and experiences not of a single lifetime, but of many generations of God-inspired men. It is a nobly-conceived endeavour to stir the conscience of the individual Israelite, and to infuse Israel's whole national life with new spiritual and moral energy. And in virtue of the wonderful combination of the national with the universal, which characterizes the higher teaching of the Old Testament, it fulfils a yet wider mission: it speaks in accents which all can still understand; it appeals to motives and principles, which can never lose their validity and truth, so long as human nature remains what it is: it is the bearer of a message to all time.*

It is the first duty of a Commentator to explain his text; and this I have striven to do to the best of my ability, partly by summaries of the argument, partly by exegetical annotations. Homiletical comments, it will be borne in mind, are purposely excluded from the plan of the series; but I hope that I have not shown myself neglectful of the more distinctive features of Biblical theology, which called for explanation. The translations have for their aim exactness, rather than elegance or literary finish: they are intended to express as fully as possible the force of the original Hebrew, which is sometimes very inadequately represented by the conventional rendering adopted in the English versions.† The illustrative references may in some instances appear to be unnecessarily numerous: but the force and significance of words, and the motives prompting their selection,—especially when they are nearly or entirely restricted to a particular group of writings,—can often be only properly estimated by copious, or even exhaustive, particulars; and the literary affinities, and influence, of Deuteronomy have seemed to me to call for somewhat full illustration. Subordinate illustrative matter—such as the discussion of special difficulties, archæological or topographical notes, &c. —has been generally distinguished from the Commentary as such by being thrown into smaller type. The explanations of various technical expressions, legal or theological, occur-

* Comp. below, pp. xix ff., xxv f., xxviii, xxxiv, &c.

† See conspicuous examples in $4^{25.\ 34.\ 36}$ 6^{16} 12^{7} 20^{11} 22^{21} $32^{6.\ 11.\ 16.\ 21}$ 33^{26}.

Digitized by Google

ring in the English versions, will, it is hoped, be found useful.

I have not deemed it desirable to exclude entirely Hebrew words from the text of the Commentary; but I have endeavoured usually to meet the needs of those not conversant with Hebrew, by adding translations, or otherwise so framing my notes as to render them intelligible to such readers. Philological matter of a technical kind has been thrown regularly into the notes. Only, sometimes, in citations, where I was tempted, by its superior brevity, to quote the Hebrew text, and in the Tables of parallel passages (pp. 10, 19, 24, &c.) —in using which the reader is supposed to have the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy open before him—will the Hebraist have an advantage over the non-Hebraist, of which the latter, I trust, will not be envious; in the case of the Tables, had I felt that the space at my disposal would permit it, I should have transcribed both texts in English, as I have done in other instances (pp. 157 f., 181 f., &c.). The Tetragrammaton—not without hesitation — has been represented by its popular, though undoubtedly incorrect, form *Jehovah*: this, it was felt, marked sufficiently the fact that the name was a *personal* one; and *Yahweh*, in a volume not designed solely for the use of specialists, might be to some readers a distasteful innovation. For typographical reasons, Arabic words have usually been transliterated in Roman characters,* and Syriac words in square Hebrew characters. Distinctions between Hebrew sounds, where they can be represented by a breathing, or a diacritic point (*ḥ*, *ṭ*, *ḳ*, *ṣ* or *ẓ*), I have thought worth preserving, though I have shrunk from carrying this principle out in the case of one or two words of very common occurrence (such as *Canaan*), in which its application might seem to savour of pedantry.

The authorities to which I am principally indebted will be usually apparent from the names quoted. A special acknow-

* ذ = dh; ض = ḍ; ط = ṭ; ح = ḥ: خ = ch; غ = gh. An occasional oversight, or irregularity, in the transliteration of a proper name, the original of which I may not have seen, will, I hope, be pardoned.

Digitized by Google

ledgment is, however, due to the great philologist and exegete of Berlin, August Dillmann, whose death, after a few days' illness, in July 1894, cut short a career of exceptional literary energy, which even advancing years seemed powerless to cripple or impair. Having in his younger and middle life won his laurels as an Orientalist by reviving, and placing upon a scientific basis, the study of Ethiopic,* he had, since 1869, devoted himself largely to the exegesis of the Old Testament, and produced commentaries upon Job,† the Hexateuch,‡ and Isaiah,§ which for thoroughness, fine scholarship, and critical yet sober judgment, rank among the best that have ever been written. Knobel, 30–40 years ago, did much for the exegesis of the Hexateuch; but a comparison of Dillmann's volumes is sufficient to show how materially he has contributed to the advance of Biblical learning, and how greatly by his labours he has raised the ideal of a Biblical Commentary. At the same time, the needs of English and German readers are not quite the same; and hence, while I have not felt it incumbent upon me to notice all the points touched upon by Dillmann, there are others which I have deemed it necessary to treat at greater length.

Deuteronomy, as remarked above, opens many topics of archæological interest; and when commencing my preparations for the present Commentary, I wrote to my friend, Professor Robertson Smith (who, as is well known, possessed an almost unique knowledge of these subjects), to inquire whether there were any particular points on which he could supply me with illustration. Unhappily his strength was already undermined by the fatal malady to which ere long he

* His *Ethiopic Grammar* appeared in 1857, his *Ethiopic Lexicon*—a magnificent folio volume of nearly 800 pages—in 1865; he also edited the Ethiopic Octateuch (Gn.-Kings), as well as many other Ethiopic texts. At the time of his death he had just completed an edition of the Ethiopic Apocrypha, which appeared about a month afterwards. See a complete list of his publications in the *Expository Times*, May 1895, p. 350 ff.

† 1869; ed. 2, 1891.

‡ *Genesis*, 1875; ed. 4, 1892: *Exodus and Leviticus*, 1880; *Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua*, 1886. An English translation of the *Commentary on Genesis* appeared in 1897 (T. & T. Clark).

§ 1890.

Digitized by Google

was destined to succumb; and he was not able to furnish me with more than a few isolated notes (see the Index, p. 434). A year has now passed since this most brilliant and accomplished scholar was taken to his rest; but in his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, his *Prophets of Israel*, and his *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (not to mention scattered articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and elsewhere), he has bequeathed a legacy to posterity, which will for long continue to be prized by students, and to stimulate reflexion and research.

The reader is requested, before using the volume, to notice the *Addenda and Corrigenda* (pp. XVIII–XXIV), and the list of principal abbreviations employed (pp. XXV–XXVIII).

S. R. D.

April 1895.

The present edition differs from the first only by the correction of a few slight *errata*, and by the introduction of some additional notes in the *Addenda and Corrigenda* (pp. XVIII–XXIII).

S. R. D.

October 1896.

The third edition differs from the second only by the introduction of a few additions and corrections, which are incorporated partly in the text, and partly in the *Addenda and Corrigenda*, pp. XVIII–XXIV.

S. R. D.

December 1901.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

Digitized by Google

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

P. xlii ff. Professor G. A. Smith, in an appreciative and instructive notice of the present work (*Critical Review*, Oct. 1895, p. 339 ff.), supports also very strongly the post-Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy, pointing in particular to the facts "that it nowhere avers to be by Moses; that its standpoint is Western Palestine, and that its whole perspective is so plainly that of some centuries after the events it describes," and also endorsing the argument deduced (p. xlii) from such passages as $23^{5\,(4)}$. He thinks, however, that if it had been written under either Manasseh or Josiah, it would have contained traces of the distinction between the persecuted servants of Jehovah and the tyrannical powers of the nation, and is inclined consequently to assign it to the close of the reign of Hezekiah (cf. p. liv, *note*). Certainly it is easier to feel satisfied that Deuteronomy is not the work of Moses than it is to fix the decade, or even the generation, in which it was actually written.

P. xliii. The "mountain(s) of the 'Abārim," or "of the parts across" (cf. G. A. Smith, *Geogr.* p. 262), Dt. 32^{49} Nu. 27^{12} $33^{47.\,48}$, of the range East of Jordan, is another not less significant indication of the country in which the Pentateuch was written.

P. xliv, *note*. For a detailed criticism of van Hoonacker's position, see Kosters in the *Th. Tijdschr.* Mar. 1896, p. 190 ff.

P. 8, l. 8–13. The other 'Ashtaroth of Eusebius, the 'Ashteroth-ḳarnaim of Gn. 14^5, is most probably *Tell 'Ashterā*, a hill about 15 miles NW. of Der'āt, with traces of ancient fortifications (Schumacher, *Across Jordan*, p. 209 f.). *El-Muzeirīb* (*ibid.* 157–166) is a large village, on an island in a small lake, which seems to have been once a strongly fortified place. *Tell el-'Ash'arī* is a long mound, situated on a projecting headland, overhanging the deep gorge of the Jarmuk, with many remains of ancient walls, built of roughly-hewn blocks of basalt (*ibid.* 203–9; G. A. Smith, *PEFQuSt.* 1901, pp. 351–9). *Tell esh-Shihāb* is a strongly situated place, standing on a promontory formed by the junction of two wādys (Schum. 199 f.; Smith, 344–350, who thinks, p. 360, that 'Og's 'Ashtaroth must have been at or near it). The supposition that there were two 'Ashtaroths depends, it will be noticed, upon Eusebius: so far as the Biblical data go, 'Ashtaroth, the capital of 'Og, might be identical with 'Ashteroth-ḳarnaim, the name being merely abbreviated from it. See more fully the writer's art. ASHTAROTH, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (T. & T. Clark); G. A. Smith, ASHTAROTH in the *Encyclop. Biblica*, and, most recently, *PEFQuSt.* 1901, pp. 340–361, with the map mentioned below, p. XXIV.

P. 11 f. Professor J. F. McCurdy, in *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments* (1894), pp. 159–161, 406–408, arrives independently at the same conclusion that *Amorite* and *Canaanite* (though each may be used *generally* of the pre-Israelitish population of Canaan) are properly the names of two distinct peoples.

P. 12 *top*. From the terms in which the "Land Amurri" is mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna letters (*c.* B.C. 1400), it appears that it was in fact simply a district or "canton," in the N. of Palestine, in the neighbourhood of Phœnicia. It was at this time, like Phœnicia and Palestine in

Digitized by Google

general, under Egyptian rule; and its governor, Aziru, addresses many letters to the Pharaoh, Amenophis IV. (see Winckler's translation of the letters in Schrader's *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, v. p. 104 ff.). The district bears the same name as late as the 9th cent. B.C.; for Asshur-nâṣir-abal (B.C. 885–860) speaks of receiving the tribute of the kings of "Tyre, Ṣidon, Gebal, Machallat, Maiṣ, Kaiṣ, *the land of Amurrai*, and Arvad, on the great sea of the West-land" (*ib.* i. 109). See Schrader's discussion of the name in the *Berichte* of the Berlin Academy, 20 Dec. 1894, p. 1302 ff.

P. 12, l. 14. See also W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern*, pp. 205–233.

P. 34, phil. note on ii. 5 ירשה: see also p. lxxi, *note* *.

P. 38. On Edom, see further F. Buhl, *Gesch. der Edomiter*, 1893.

P. 38, l. 8–7 from bottom. According to the map and description given by Mr. Bliss, *PEFQuSt.* July 1895, pp. 204, 215, the Sail es-Sa'ideh flows into the Mojib from the *East*, the Sail Lejjûn flowing into it from S. by E., and a shorter stream, the Wādy Balu'a, from the S. The three deep gorges formed by these streams unite to form the Wādy Mojib, at a point slightly to the E. of 'Ara'ir (below, p. 45).

P. 41, l. 9. Professor Sayce has since abandoned this view of Caphtor, on the ground that a place of that name (Kaptar) is mentioned among the places conquered by Ptolemy Auletes (Hastings' *DB.* art. CAPHTOR).

P. 45. 'Ara'ir "crowns one of the natural buttresses that round out from the cliffs, and affords a capital bird's-eye view of the upper waters of the Arnon" (Bliss in *PEFQuSt.* July 1895, p. 215).

P. 47, l. 4 from bottom. The oaks, it should have been stated, are found only on the slopes of the Jebel Ḥauran, or on the West, in Jôlan: the plain of Ḥauran is destitute either of oaks or of other trees.

P. 48–49. The identification of the Leja with Argob is rejected also (independently), I am glad to see, by G. A. Smith, *Geogr.* p. 551.

P. 49, l. 11 from bottom, and p. 56, l. 6–7. Although Ḳenath is very commonly identified with Ḳanawāt, the identification is not, however, certain: see Moore on Jud. 8^{11}; and comp. Wright, *Palmyra and Zenobia* (1895), p. 313 f.

P. 50–51. See further, on the region here in question, the writer's articles ARGOB in Hastings' *DB.* and BASHAN in the *Encyclop. Biblica.*

P. 54, l. 5. The Arabs on the east of Jordan still call basalt *iron* (G. A. Smith).

P. 57. On Machir and the other clans of Manasseh see now more fully MACHIR and MANASSEH in Hastings' *DB.*

P. 63–64. On Baal, see further the articles by G. F. Moore and A. S. Peake, in the *Encyclop. Biblica* and Hastings' *DB.* respectively.

P. 64, on 4^{5}: *to possess it* (לרשתה). On the very common Deut. word ירש (p. lxxviii ff., Nos. 4, 22, 46), it should have been stated that, though (for distinction from נָחַל, נַחֲלָה) it is commonly rendered *to possess*, it denotes properly *to take possession of as heir*, *to succeed to* (cf. $2^{12. 21. 22}$; יורש אותי Gn. 15^{3}; היורש *the heir*, 2 S. 14^{7}; יְרֻשָּׁה *the right of inheritance*, Jer. 32^{8}); and that this sense of the word gives point to most of the passages in which it is used, not only in Dt. ($1^{8. 21}$ &c.), but also elsewhere, as 1 K. 21^{19} הרצחת וגם ירשת, Mic. 1^{15} Jer. 8^{10} $49^{1. 2}$ Hab. 1^{6} &c. Cf. p. lxxi, *note* *.

Digitized by Google

P. 67, l. 5 from bottom: "is found first in JE." See, however, Dt. 33^{9}.

P. 68. On the "covenant," see also Smend, ***Alttest. Religionsgesch.*** p. 294 ff.; and R. Kraetzschmar, ***Die Bundesvorstellung im AT.***, 1896.

P. 70 ***top***. See also J. Jacobs, ***Studies in Biblical Archæology*** (1894), pp. xix, 64–103 (where the question whether there are Totem-Clans in the OT. is discussed with discrimination).

P. 79. The Βοσορ of 1 Macc. $5^{26ff.}$, as Professor G. A. Smith points out, must have been considerably to the N. of Moab, and cannot therefore be the same place as the Moabite Beẓer.

P. 79, l. 11. On the claims of es-Salṭ to represent the ancient Ramoth of Gile'ad, my friend, the Rev. G. A. Cooke, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, who visited the site in 1894, writes: "A survey of the references to Ramoth in the OT., shows that it must have been a place of administrative and strategic importance with respect to Bashan on the one hand (1 K. 4^{13}), and Syria and N. Israel on the other (1 K. $22^{3ff.}$), accessible from Samaria and Jezreel by road (1 K. 22^{37} 2 K. $8^{28f.}$ 9^{16}); it must have lain consequently N., and indeed considerably N., of the Jabbok: its environs, also, were convenient for chariot warfare (1 K. $22^{31ff.}$). It is difficult under these circumstances to understand how it can have been identified with es-Salṭ, the physical features of which present none of the conditions which the Biblical passages require for Ramoth. Any one who has visited es-Salṭ must have been convinced of the impossibility of approaching it with chariots. The town hangs on the steep sides of a narrow gorge, entirely shut in on the N., and opening out on a narrow flat of garden-land at the other end; and even this open extremity of the ravine is blocked by a high ridge at right angles to the town, closing up the only outlet. The descent into the town, and the streets on the two sides of the ravine, are so steep that a rider is almost compelled to dismount and lead his horse. Es-Salṭ is, moreover, far too South,—only 18 miles N. of the Dead Sea, and 12 miles *South* of the Jabboḳ: it is quite off the road to Bashan, while there is no line of natural highway between it and Samaria or Jezreel. El-jal'ûd, Dillmann's site, is hardly more suitable: it is still S. of the Jabboḳ. Merrill, *East of Jordan*, p. 284 ff., proposes Jerash, about 22 miles N.W. of es-Salṭ, in nearly the same parallel of latitude as Samaria; and it is true that the rolling plateau on which Jerash stands would be suitable enough for chariots, and in Græco-Roman times, at any rate, there must have been easy communication between Jerash (Gerasa) and W. Palestine." This suggestion must be admitted to be a plausible one: though Mr. Cooke himself (with G. A. Smith, *Geogr.* p. 587) would prefer a site still further North, and nearer to Edre'i (Der'ât), whence access would be easy to either Jezreel or Samaria, up the broad valley now called the Wâdy Jal'ûd, leading up from the Jordan to Jezreel (*ib.* p. 384 f.). Der'ât is about 25 m. NNE. of Jerash, and 30 m. ESE. of the Lake of Gennesareth.

P. 102, footnote. Add Jer. 8^{1} 16^{7} 31^{14b} 44^{9}. On the difficult verse Jud. 1^{16}, see Moore, *ad loc.*, in 1^{34} the suffix (though the pl. would be far more natural) might perhaps be taken as referring to דן, as in 7^{4} to העם, and in 20^{4} to the collective איש בנימין of v.[41] (where notice עליו, and the sing. verbs).

P. 103, l. 5. *Wine*, here (7^{13}), and 11^{14} 12^{17} 14^{23} 18^{4} 28^{51} 33^{28}, should have been *new wine*, or *must*. תירוש is distinguished from יין, and ought to be represented by a different word. It is the freshly expressed juice of

Digitized by Google

the grape (cf. Pr. 3^{10} Joel 2^{24}), capable, as Hos. 4^{11} shows, of "taking away the understanding," and therefore fermented, but probably with the fermentation arrested at an earlier stage than was the case with "wine" (יין) properly so called (comp. Smith's *Dict. of Classical Antiquities*, s.v. VINUM, towards the beginning, where it is shown that the ancients in making the best wines allowed the fermentation of the grape-juice to run its full course of nine days, but that sweet wines were often manufactured by its being arrested after two or three days). In view of Pr. 3^{10} Joel 2^{24}, however, it is difficult to feel sure whether תירוש *always* denoted a fermented beverage. See more fully, on *Tirosh*, A. M. Wilson, *The Wines of the Bible*, 1877, p. 301 ff.; and the note in the writer's *Joel and Amos* (in the *Camb. Bible for Schools*), p. 79 f.

In lines 9–10 of the same page, "if not absolutely" is hardly correct. דגן is not the raw produce of the fields, but corn which has been threshed out (Nu. 18^{27}); and יצהר, analogously to תירוש, is the freshly expressed juice of the olive. The last-named word (7^{13} 11^{14} 12^{17} 14^{23} 18^{4} 28^{51}), for distinction from שמן (8^{8} 28^{40} 32^{13} 33^{24}), would have been better rendered *fresh oil;* cf. the denom. יצהירו "make fresh oil" in Job 24^{11}.

P. 103, on 7^{15}. The reference is probably, in particular, to epidemics such as the plague, which, starting from the NE. corner of the Delta, were apt to pass up the avenues of trade, through Philistia and the Maritime Plain, into Israel (cf. G. A. Smith, *Geogr.* pp. 157–160).

P. 129, l. 6 from bottom. The last-named explanation is probably the correct one. For purposes of irrigation, each plot of land is divided into small squares by ridges of earth a few inches in height; and the water, after it has been raised from the Nile by the *Shadûf* or the *Sâḳieh*, is conducted into these squares by means of small trenches. The cultivator uses his feet to regulate the flow of water to each part, by a dexterous movement of the toes raising or breaking down small embankments in the trenches, and opening or closing apertures in the ridges (Manning, *The Land of the Pharaohs*, 1887, p. 31).

P. 133 f. Moses being represented as speaking in the plains of Moab, just opposite to Gilgal, G. A. Smith points out the great difficulty involved in the supposition that the words *in front of Gilgal* are intended to define the position of mountains so far distant as 'Ebal and Gerizim, and adopts (in his review) the punctuation and rendering of Colenso, as given on p. 134. But attention has been called recently to the fact that there is a place Juleijil (Arab. dimin. of "Gilgal"), with "traces of ruins" (*PEF. Memoirs*, ii. 238) in the plain Mâkhna, 1 mile E. of Gerizim: and Buhl (*Geogr.* 202 f.) and G. A. Smith (art. GILGAL in the *Encyclop. Biblica*) both accept Schlatter's identification of this place with the Gilgal of Dt. 11^{30}. The discovery of the name so close to 'Ebal and Gerizim justifies Dillmann's hypothesis (below, p. 134), and meets the objections to it there mentioned: while, if Gilgal was simply an ancient sacred place, the absence of more extensive ruins would be accounted for. The Gilgal (𝔊 Γαλγαλα) of 1 Macc. 9^{2} is also very probably the same place (G. A. Smith, *ibid.*).

P. 140, **xii. 3**: Grätz (*Emendd. in plerosque V.T. libros*, Fasc. iii. 1894, p. 10) may be right in supposing that the verbs תשרפון and תגרעון have accidentally changed places; cf. 𝔊 and $7^{5.25}$.

b

Digitized by Google

P. 142, l. 2 from bottom: comp. also the קָרְבַּן העצים of Neh. 10^{35} 13^{31}†.

P. 161. About the Cape, an allied species of the Hyrax (the *Hyrax Capensis*) is called the ***rock-rabbit***, which would be as convenient an English name for the ***shāphān*** as could readily be found.

P. 162, phil. note on v. **15**, l. 5: מִנֵּהוּ Ps. 68^{34} was accidentally overlooked. After "besides," in l. 4, "except with nouns formed from ל״ה verbs, as מעשהו," should have been added.

P. 163, l. 7–8: *add* (*after* reptiles), "and small quadrupeds, as the weasel and the mouse (Lev. 11^{29})."

P. 180, **xv. 9**: פן יהיה עם לבבך דָּבָר בליעל should perhaps be read (cf. Grätz).

P. 181, l. 2. So in 𝕾 (cf. also 𝕲) of Sir. $14^{8.10}$ 18^{15} 31^{13} 37^{29}; and, conversely, with *good*, 31^{23} $35^{8.10}$. Cf. the Heb. in $14^{3.10}$ $31^{13\,(bis)}$ 35^{10}.

P. 196, **xvi. 10**: for the strange מכת, Grätz suggests כַּפַּת (better, perhaps, קַבַּת; notice the preceding כ); cf. v.[17], and Ez. $46^{5.11}$ (מנחה מתת ידו). *Tribute* (AV., RV.) comes from a very improbable etymological connexion with מַס ***task-work*** (20^{11}).

P. 206, l. 4 of note on v. **5**: *add* "Dt. 21^{19} $22^{21.24}$ 1 K. $21^{10.13}$ Hos. 9^{13}."

P. 232, **xix. 5**: on נשל, see on 7^1 (phil. n.); and Levy, *NHWB*. iii. 451 (used in post-Bibl. Heb. of the *falling off* of limbs). Grätz, however, suggests נפל (𝕲 ἐκπεσὸν: cf. 2 K. 6^5).

P. 234 f., on 19^{14}. A high importance was attached in ancient Babylonia also to the landmark; and many of the stone pillars which once served as landmarks still exist, inscribed with terrible imprecations directed against any who should disturb them: see Maspero, ***Dawn of Civilisation***, p. 762 f., with the references, where also there is a representation of the so-called "Michaux stone," now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris; the inscription on this is translated in Trumbull, *The Threshold Covenant*, 1896, pp. 167–9.

P. 255, note *. See also Trumbull, *The Threshold Covenant*, p. 245 ff.

P. 257, on 22^{22}. Adultery, in either sex, is still in Palestine liable to be punished with death, whether inflicted by the husband, or by the next-of-kin: see *PEFQuSt.* 1897, pp. 125–7.

P. 269, **xxiii. 25**: is שבעך a gloss on כנפשך?

P. 276, **xxiv. 14**: שָׂכָר for שכיר 𝕲𝕾𝖁 Grätz (cf. Mal. 3^5); and om. בארצך 𝕲𝕾 Grätz (cf. then 5^{14} 31^{12}).

P. 283, on 25^7. יְבָמִי is for יְבָמְנִי, as twice besides (לְחַתִּי Nu. 22^{13}; לְבִלְתִּי עָצְבִּי 1 Ch. 4^{10}): König, iii. 124; cf. G-K. § 115^c *end*.

P. 291, on 26^{14}. On אָוֶן, and the various meanings attached to it, see more fully the Glossary in the writer's *Parallel Psalter* (1898), p. 449 f.

P. 297, on 27^7. The combination עולות ושלמים (not עולות וזבחים) agrees with the usage of E, Ex. 20^{24} 32^6, cf. 24^5 (Budde, *ZATW*. 1891, p. 228).

P. 310, phil. note on v. **27**, l. 5: In Syriac (PS. 1456) טְחַר means *tenesmo laboravit*, and טוּחְרָא and טְחָרָא mean *dysentery;* and hence it might have been supposed that the Heb. טחורים meant similarly *dysentery* (lit. *tenesmi*): but in 1 S. $6^{11.17}$ it is used of something of which images could be made; and in the Pesh. of 1 S. 6–7, and in Ephr. Syrus, טחורא means the anus (it also, acc. to Bar-Sarvashvi, *ap.* PS., denotes parts of the intestine protruding in dysentery). But whatever טחורים may signify, its only bearing upon עפלים is that, as a gloss upon it, it supports the general tradition (already found in 𝕲 ἕδρα) that this word denotes either the anus, or some

Digitized by Google

affection of it, not plague-boils (which appear in the armpit or groin). (The rend. *dysenteric tumours*, proposed for טחורים in ed. 2, seems to be open to objection upon pathological grounds: see Hastings' *DB.* iii. 325.)

P. 326, **xxix. 19 (20)**: Grätz also adopts ורבקה for ורבצה.

P. 329, phil. note on **xxx. 3**: It should have been explained that לְזוּת (Pr. 4^{24}†) from לוּז is irregular; and that even רָמוּת (from רום) is a form only once found from a verb ע״ו, in a passage (Ez. 32^{5}) where the text is (upon other grounds) doubtful, while both these forms are common from verbs ל״ה (כְּסוּת, גָּלוּת, &c.). Preuschen, in a long study on the expression (*ZATW.* 1895, p. 1 ff.), returns to the old explanation of it, pointing in particular to the support which this derives from Jer. $48^{46f.}$, comp. with Nu. 21^{29}: the more general, metaphorical sense, he finds beginning in Lam. 2^{14} Ps. 85^{2} 126^{4}, and completed in Job 42^{10}.

P. 330 *footnote*. Add Ez. 11^{5b}.

P. 346 f. G. A. Smith supports Dillmann's date for the Song in c. 32, observing, among other things, that, if it had been a work of the Chaldæan age, some allusion tq *exile* might naturally have been expected among the threatened judgments.

P. 356, l. 6. So also Oort (in a review of the present work), *Th. Tijdschr.* 1896, p. 300.

P. 362, l. 7–5 from bottom. See the *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, ii. 141, l. 52–56 (Esarhaddon). Cf. p. 78, l. 189, "may the protecting *shîdu* (*shîdu nâṣiru*) rule therein"; 113, l. 52–54; 137, l. 41–47, &c.

P. 368. On the Egyptian god *Resoup* (or *Rashouf*), cf. Maspero, *Struggle of the Nations*, p. 155 f.

P. 389. On Dt. 33, see also A. van der Flier, *Deuteronomium* 33. *Een exegetisch-historische studie* (Leiden, 1895); and C. J. Ball in the *Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Arch.*, April, 1896, p. 118 ff.

P. 398, on 33^{8}. 𝔊 has here *Δότε Λευεὶ δήλους αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀλήθειαν αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀνδρὶ τῷ ὁσίῳ*, which points to the reading—

חן ללוי תמיך
ואוריך לאיש חֲסִידֶךָ

which much improves the poetical symmetry of the verse (comp. the Abbé Loisy in the *Bulletin Critique*, 1896, No. 15, p. 284; Ball, p. 123 f.).

P. 404, on 33^{12}. Böklen (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1894, p. 365 f.) and Oort (*l.c.* p. 298 ff.) argue that the reference here is to the great North-Israelitish sanctuary of Bethel (Am. $7^{10.13}$ &c.), which also, as it happens, lay on the "shoulder" of a hill (Jos. 18^{13}).

P. 404 f., on 33^{13-16}. Lagarde (*Agathangelus*, 1887, p. 156, cf. p. 162 f.) prints this passage, and Gen. 49^{25-26}, line by line, in parallel columns. The comparison is instructive; it shows that the text of Dt., though not free from corruption, is more correct than that of Gen. מגד, it may be noticed, takes in Dt. the place of ברכת in Gen.

P. 409, on 33^{18}. שׂפוני must at least be either an error of transcription for צפוני, or an anomalous variation for it (cf. שׂחק by the side of צחק, and ישׂחק 4 times for יצחק). 𝔊 *καὶ ἐμπόρια παράλιον κατοικούντων* appears (Ball, p. 130) to have read ומכוני שֹׁכְנֵי חוֹף (see Gen. 49^{13}, where *Ζαβουλὼν παράλιος κατοικήσει* stands for זבולן לחוף ימים ישכן).

P. 411, on 33^{21}. The difficulties of clauses [b, c] of this verse—especially

Digitized by Google

of clause [b]—where *reserved* is a most questionable paraphrase, since ספן everywhere else means *panelled* (1 K. $7^{3.7}$ Jer. 22^{14} Hag. 1^{4}; cf. 1 K. $6^{9.15}$)—are removed—if the means adopted are not thought too violent—by an ingenious suggestion of Giesebrecht's (*ZATW* 1887, p. 292 f.). 𝕲 for ספן ויתא has *συνηγμένων ἅμα*, whence Giesebrecht infers that the letters have been transposed through some accident from ויתאספון: the words ויתאספון ראשי עם, as they connect indifferently with what precedes, he then supposes to have been originally a gloss, intended as an allusion to the incidents recorded in Nu. 32, and formulated on the basis of the phrase in v.[5] בהתאסף ראשי עם.

P. 416, on 33^{27}. For מענה Lagarde (*l.c.* p. 163) proposes מלמעלה; Ball, מִמַּעַל, which is poetically preferable. Either of these words would form a good antithesis to מתחת in the following clause (cf. Ex. 20^{4}).

P. 422. On the palm-groves of Jericho, see also the numerous quotations, principally from the classical writers, given by Schürer, *Nsg.*[2] i. 311–313. At present they have all but disappeared; Robinson (*l.c.*) saw in 1838 but one, which in 1888 had become a stump (*ZDPV.* xi. 98).

It may be convenient to mention here some works and articles bearing on Deuteronomy, which have appeared since the first edition of the present Commentary was published in 1895: the Commentaries of Steuernagel (in Nowack's series), 1898, and of Bertholet (in Marti's series), 1899; Deuteronomy in vol. ii. of Addis, *The Documents of the Hexateuch* (1898), pp. 1–165; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *The Hexateuch, according to the Revised Version, arranged in its constituent documents, with Introduction, Notes, Marginal References, and Synoptical Tables* (1900), esp. i. 85–96, 161–4, 200–7, 222 ff., and ii. 246–302 (the text of the book); H. G. Mitchell, *The Use of the Second Person in Deuteronomy*, in *JBLit.* 1899, pp. 61–109 (a consideration of the question whether the varying use of the sing. and plur. of the 2nd pers. in Deut. is an indication of different authors. The same distinction had been made the basis of (divergent) analyses of Deut. by Stärk, *Das Deut., sein Inhalt und seine literarische Form*, 1894, and by Steuernagel, both in previous studies and in his *Commentary*. Steuernagel's theory is criticized by Bertholet in the *Theol. Lit.-zeit.* Aug. 19, 1899; cf. also Addis, pp. 15–19, and Carpenter, ii. 246 f.); G. L. Robinson in the *Expositor*, 1898 Oct., Nov., 1899 Feb., April, May (seeks to maintain the Mosaic authorship); the articles on Deuteronomy in the *Encyclop. Biblica*, by G. F. Moore, and Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, by H. E. Ryle, as well as many other articles in these two works illustrative of the geographical and other antiquities of the book. Many of the Aramaic and Phœnician *Inscriptions* referred to in the notes (see the Index, p. 432) are also now accessible in the selection contained in Lidzbarski's very valuable *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik*, 1898, p. 415 ff. (see also the very complete Glossary, pp. 204–388, 500–504, and the Index of grammatical forms, proper names, &c., pp. 389–412). For the topography of the book, the large *Topographical and Physical Map of Palestine* (including the region E. of Jordan), by J. G. Bartholomew and G. A. Smith (T. & T. Clark), should be consulted.

Digitized by Google

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS EMPLOYED.

Benzinger	.	Benzinger, J., *Hebr. Archäologie*, 1894. An eminently readable, ably-written survey of the antiquities of the Old Testament.
BR.	.	Robinson, Edw., *Biblical Researches in Palestine, &c.*, ed. 2 (London, 1856).
CIS.	.	*Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881 ff.
Dav.	.	A. B. Davidson, *Hebrew Syntax* (Edin. 1894). An excellent work, which may be warmly commended to English Hebraists. It only reached me in time to be referred to on c. 29 ff.
DB. or *DB.*[2]	.	*A Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by W. Smith, ed. 1 (1863); or ed. 2 (AARON–JUTTAH), 1893.
Dr.	.	Driver, S. R., *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (ed. 3, Oxford, 1892).
Dillm. (or Di.)	.	Dillmann, Aug., *Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, in the *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum AT.*, 1886 (re-written, on the basis of Knobel's Commentary [Knob. or Kn.] in the same series, 1861).
Ew.	.	Ewald, H., *Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache*, ed. 7, 1863; ed. 8, 1870. The *Syntax* has been translated by J. Kennedy, Edin. 1881.
G.-K.	.	*Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräische Grammatik*, völlig umgearbeitet von Ed. Kautzsch, ed. 25, 1889. The best grammar for ordinary purposes, the present edition being greatly improved, especially in the syntax. An English translation (of ed. 26, 1896) was published in 1898 (Clarendon Press).
HWB. or *HWB.*[2]		*Handwörterbuch des Bibl. Altertums*, ed. by Edw. Riehm, ed. 1, 1884; or ed. 2, 1893–1894.
Holzinger	.	Holzinger, H., *Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, 1893. A comprehensive discussion of the problems presented by the Hexateuch, with a survey of the principal solutions that have been offered of them. The tabular synopses of the literary usages of the various sources are the most complete, and critical, that have been hitherto constructed.

JBLit. . . . *Journal of Biblical Literature* (Mass. U.S.A.).

JPh. . . . *Journal of Philology* (Cambridge and London).

Kleinert . . . Kleinert, P., *Das Deuteronomium und der Deuteronomiker*, 1872.

Kön. . . . König, F. E., *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der Hebr. Sprache*, vol. i. 1881; vol. ii. 1895; vol. iii. 1897.

Remarkably comprehensive and complete. The special value of the work consists in the careful discussion of all difficult or anomalous forms, and the copious references to other authorities, both ancient and modern. Vol. i. comprises the "Lautlehre," and the "Formenlehre" of verbs; vol. ii. deals principally with the "Formenlehre" of nouns; and contains, both on that and on other subjects (*e.g.* p. 207 ff., the order of numerals, classified and tabulated; p. 234 ff., the usage of advs., preps., and interjections), an abundance of useful and interesting information. Vol. iii. contains the syntax.

Kuen. . . . Kuenen, A., *The Hexateuch* (Engl. trans. of the corresponding part of the author's *Hist.-crit. inquiry into the origin of the books of the OT.*), 1886.

Lex. . . . *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT., based on the Lexicon and Thesaurus of Gesenius*, by F. Brown, C. A. Briggs, and S. R. Driver, Oxford, 1891 ff. (parts 1–10, reaching as far as קץ, at present [Nov. 1901] published).

L.O.T. . . . *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, by S. R. Driver (Edin. 1891; ed. 5, 1894; ed. 7, 1898).

The references are to the pages of edd. 1–5, which are indicated in edd. 6 and 7 by figures in heavy type inserted in square brackets in the text.

NHB. . . . *Natural History of the Bible*, by H. B. Tristram, ed. 2, London, 1868.

Nowack . . . Nowack, W., *Lehrbuch der Hebr. Archäologie*, 1894.

A manual, similar to that of Benzinger, noted above, but larger, and offering more explanation and discussion of the subjects dealt with. Both these works are valuable aids to the study of the OT.; and from the time when they reached me, I have referred to them frequently.

Oettli . . . Oettli, S., *Das Deuteronomium u. die Bb. Josua u. Richter* (in Strack and Zöckler's "Kurzgefasster Kommentar"), 1893.

Less elaborate and complete than the Commentary of Dillmann, but sensible, moderate, and critical.

Ols. . . . Olshausen, Justus, *Lehrbuch der Heb. Sprache*, i. 1861. (No syntax.) A masterly work.

OTJC., or *OTJC.*[2] *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, by W. Robertson Smith, ed. 1, 1881; ed. 2, 1892.

Digitized by Google

NZg.[2] . . .	*Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, by Emil Schürer, 1886, 1890. The pages of ed. 2 are indicated on the margins of ed. 3 (1898, 1901).
PEF. . . .	Palestine Exploration Fund.
PEFQuSt. . .	*Quarterly Statement* of do.
PRE.[2] . . .	Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, ed. 2, 1877–1888.
PS. . . .	Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*.
S. & P. . .	*Sinai and Palestine in connection with their History*, by A. P. Stanley, ed. 1864.
Schultz . .	Schultz, F. W., *Das Deuteronomium erklärt*, 1859.
Samuel, *Notes on* (or "on Sam.")	*Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, with an Introduction on Hebrew Palæography and the Ancient Versions, and Facsimiles of Inscriptions*, by S. R. Driver (Oxford, 1890).
Stade . . .	Stade, Bernhard, *Lehrbuch der Hebr. Grammatik*, i. 1879. (No syntax.) Very convenient and useful.
ThT. . . .	*Theologisch Tijdschrift* (Leiden).
Valeton, *Studiën* .	Valeton, J. J. P., six articles on the contents and structure of Dt., in the *Studiën*, published in connexion with the *Theol. Tijdschrift* (Leiden), v. (1879), parts 2, 3-4; vi. (1880), parts 2-3, 4; vii. (1881), parts 1, 3.
Wellh. *Comp.* .	Wellhausen, J., *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des AT.s*, 1889. A reprint of the important articles on the composition of the Hexateuch, published by the author to the *Jahrb. für Deutsche Theologie*, 1876, p. 392 ff., p. 531 ff., 1877, p. 407 ff.; and of the matter contributed by him to the 4th edition of Bleek's *Einleitung in das AT.* (1878), on the composition of Jud. Sam. and Kings.
Westphal . .	Westphal, Al., *Les Sources du Pentateuque*, Étude de critique et d'histoire. i. (1888) Le problème littéraire; ii. (1892) Le problème historique. Extremely well-written, the author often rising to real eloquence. Vol. i. contains an historical account of the rise and progress of the critical study of the Hexateuch; vol. ii. a comparative study, literary and historical, of the documents of which the Hexateuch is composed.
ZATW. . .	*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, ed. by B. Stade.
ZDMG. . .	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*
ZDPV. . .	*Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*
ZKWL. . .	*Zeitschrift für Kirchliche Wissenschaft und Kirchliches Leben.*

MT. = Massoretic text.

Digitized by Google

𝕲 = the Greek Version of the OT. (the LXX); 𝕷 = Lucian's recension of the LXX; 𝕺 = Onkelos; 𝕾 = the Syriac Version (Peshiṭto); 𝕿 = Targum; 𝖁 = Vulgate.

AV. = Authorized Version; RV. = Revised Version.

D = the Deuteronomist; D^2 = Deuteronomic sections of Joshua, or sometimes (as p. lxxvi f.) secondary parts of Deuteronomy; "Deut.," attached to citations from Jud. or Kings, indicates that the passages referred to are the work of the Deuteronomic compilers of the books in question (see p. xci f.).

The signs JE, H, and P—denoting the other Pentateuchal sources—are explained in the Introduction, p. iii f.

Biblical passages are quoted according to the Hebrew enumeration of chapters and verses: where this differs in the English (as in Dt. 13. 23. 29), the reference to the latter has been (usually) appended in a parenthesis; as Dt. $23^{16\,(15)}$; 28^{69} (29^{1}); 1 Ch. $6^{65\,(80)}$; Joel 4 $(3)^{5}$.

The sign †, following a series of references, indicates that all examples of the word or form in question, occurring in the OT., have been quoted.

Digitized by Google

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. *Introductory. Outline of Contents.*

Deuteronomy, the name of the fifth book of the Pentateuch, is derived from *τὸ Δευτερονόμιον τοῦτο*, the (ungrammatical) LXX. rendering of מִשְׁנֵה הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת in 17^{18}.* Although, however, based upon a grammatical error, the name is not an inappropriate one; for Deuteronomy (see 28^{69} [AV. 29^{1}]) does embody the terms of a second legislative "covenant," and includes (by the side of much fresh matter) a repetition of a large part of the laws contained in what is sometimes called the "First Legislation" of Exodus.† The period covered by it is the last month of the wanderings of the Israelites (cf. 1^{3} 34^{8}). The book consists chiefly of three discourses, purporting to have been delivered by Moses in the "Steppes" (34^{1}) of Moab, setting forth the laws which the Israelites are to obey, and the spirit in which they are to obey them, when they are settled in the land of promise. More particularly the contents of the Book may be exhibited as follows:—

1^{1-5} Introduction, specifying the place and time at which the following discourses were delivered.

1^{6}–4^{40} Moses' *first*, or introductory, discourse, comprising (*a*) a historical retrospect, reviewing the principal incidents of the Israelites' journey from Ḥoreb, and exemplifying the providence which had brought them through the desert, and past the territory of envious or hostile neighbours to the

* The Heb. words can only mean "a repetition (*i.e.* copy) of this law," not "this repetition of the law" (which would require הַזֶּה for הַזֹּאת, besides being inconsistent with the meaning of משנה). The same misrendering of משנה recurs Jos. 9^{5} LXX. (=Heb. 8^{32}). By the Jews the book is called, from its opening words, אלה הדברים, or, more briefly, דברים (*Debārīm*).

† Ex. 20^{22}–23^{33}. See p. iii; W. R. Smith, *OTJC.*² pp. 318, 340 ff.

Digitized by Google

border of the Promised Land (1^6–3^{29}); and (*b*) the practical conclusion of the preceding retrospect, *viz.* an appeal to the nation, reminding it of its obligations to its Benefactor, and urging it not to forget the great truths of the spirituality and sole Godhead of Jehovah, impressed upon it at Ḥoreb (4^{1-40}).

4^{41-43} Account of the appointment by Moses of three Cities of refuge in the trans-Jordanic territory.

4^{44-49} Superscription to Moses' *second* discourse, containing the Exposition of the Law (c. 5–26. 28).

C. 5–26. 28 The Exposition of the Law, the central and principal part of the book, falling naturally into two parts: (*a*) c. 5–11, consisting of a hortatory introduction, developing the first commandment of the Decalogue, and inculcating the *general* theocratic principles by which Israel, as a nation, is to be governed; (*b*) c. 12–26. 28, comprising the code of *special* laws, which it is the object of the legislator to "expound" (1^5), and encourage Israel to obey.

C. 28, connected closely with 26^{19}, and declaring impressively the blessings and curses which Israel may expect to follow, according as it observes, or neglects, the Deuteronomic law, forms the peroration of the central discourse (c. 5–26).

C. 27 Instructions (interrupting the discourse of Moses, and narrated in the 3rd person) relative to a symbolical acceptance by the nation of the Deuteronomic Code, after its entrance into Canaan.

$29^{1\,(2)}$–30^{20} Moses' *third* discourse, of the nature of a supplement, insisting afresh upon the fundamental duty of loyalty to Jehovah, and embracing (1) an appeal to Israel to accept the terms of the Deuteronomic covenant, with a renewed warning of the disastrous consequences of a lapse into idolatry ($29^{1-28\,(2-29)}$); (2) a promise of restoration, even after the abandonment threatened in c. 28, provided the nation then sincerely repents (30^{1-10}); (3) the choice now set before Israel (30^{11-20}).

31^{1-8} Moses' last words of encouragement to the people and Joshua.

31^{9-13} Moses' delivery of the Deuteronomic law to the Levitical priests, with instructions for it to be read publicly every seven years.

$31^{14-15.\,23}$ Commission of Joshua by Jehovah.

$31^{16-22.\,24-30}$ $32^{1-43.\,44}$ The Song of Moses, with accompanying notices.

32^{45-47} Moses' final commendation of the Deuteronomic law to Israel.

32^{48}–34^{12} Conclusion of the whole book, containing the Blessing of Moses (c. 33), and narrating the circumstances of his death.

The *legislation* of Dt., properly so called, is thus included in c. 12–26, to which c. 5–11 form an introduction, and c. 28 a conclusion. Even here, however, not less than in every other part of his discourses, the author's aim is still essentially *parenetic*; he does not merely collect, or repeat, a series of laws; he "expounds" them (1^5), *i.e.* he develops them with reference to the moral purposes which they subserve, and the motives by which the Israelite should feel prompted to

Digitized by Google

obey them. In Dt. itself, the expression *this law* frequently occurs, denoting either the Code of laws, of which it is the "exposition" (1^{5}, with the note), or (more usually) the exposition itself (1^{5} 4^{8} (cf. v.^{44}) $17^{18.19}$ $27^{3.8.26}$ $28^{58.61}$ $29^{28(29)}$ $31^{9.11.12.24}$ 32^{46}; cf. *this book of the law* $29^{20(21)}$ 30^{10} 31^{26}; so Jos. 1^{8}). That this expression refers to Dt., and not to the entire Pent., appears (1) from the wording of 1^{5} $4^{8.44}$, which points to a law on the point of being set forth; (2) from the parallel expressions *this commandment*, *these statutes*, *these judgments*, which are often spoken of as inculcated *to-day* (7^{12} [see v.^{11}] 15^{5} 19^{9} 26^{16} 30^{11}).

§ 2. *Relation of Deuteronomy to the preceding Books of the Pentateuch.*

In order to gain a right estimate of Deuteronomy, it is necessary to compare it carefully with the books of Genesis to Numbers, upon which, in its legislative and historical parts alike, it is largely based. In conducting this comparison, it must be borne in mind that these books are not homogeneous, but are composed of distinct documents, each marked by definite literary and other features, peculiar to itself. Of these documents, one bears a *prophetical* character, and, showing itself marks of being in turn composed of two sources, in one of which the name *Jehovah* is preferred, while the other uses generally *Elohim*, is commonly denoted by the symbol JE; the other bears a *priestly* character, and may be referred to accordingly by the letter P.* Each of these documents consists in part of laws, which fall into three groups or *Codes*, differing considerably from each other in character and scope. The *first* of these Codes is that contained in JE, viz. Ex. 20–23, comprising the Decalogue (Ex. 20^{1-17}), and the laws in Ex. 20^{22}–23^{33}—commonly known as the "Book of the Covenant" (see Ex. 24^{7})—consisting chiefly of *civil* enactments, designed for the use of a community living under simple conditions of society, but partly also of rudimentary

* See more fully the writer's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (cited afterwards as *L.O.T.*), pp. 6-8, 11-12, 109 ff., 118 ff.

Digitized by Google

religious regulations (20^{22-26} $22^{17. 19 (18. 20). 28-30 (29-31)}$ 23^{10-19}), to which must be added the repetition of many of the latter enactments in Ex. 34^{10-26}, and the kindred regulations (on the Feast of Unleavened Cakes, and the Dedication of the First-born) in Ex. 13^{3-16}. The *second* Code consists of the laws contained in P, and relating in particular to the sacrificial system, and other ceremonial institutions of the Hebrews; these occupy the greater part of Ex. 25–31. 35–40. Lev. 1–16. 27. Nu. 1^{1}–10^{28}. 15. 18–19. 25^{10}–36, now frequently termed, from the predominant character of its contents, the "Priests' Code." The *third* Code, also now incorporated in P, but once distinct from it, and marked by many special features of its own, is the group of laws—partly moral (c. 18. 19 (largely). 20), partly ceremonial—contained in Lev. 17–26, often called by modern scholars (from the principle which it strives mainly to enforce) the "Law of Holiness," and denoted for brevity by the symbol H.*

It will be convenient to consider first the legislative parts of Dt. The following synopsis will show immediately which of the laws in Dt. relate to subjects not dealt with in the other Codes, and which are parallel to provisions there contained.

SYNOPSIS OF LAWS IN DEUTERONOMY.

JE.	DEUTERONOMY.	P (INCLUDING H).
Ex. 20^{2-17}	$5^{6-18 (21)}$ The Decalogue	
20^{24*}	12^{1-28} (place of sacrifice)	Lev. 17^{1-9*}
cf. 23^{24} $34^{12. 15f.}$	12^{29-31} (not to imitate Canaanite rites)	Nu. 33^{52}
cf. $22^{19 (20)}$	c. 13 (cases of seduction to idolatry)	
	14^{1-2} (disfigurement in mourning)	Lev. 19^{28a}
	14^{3-20} (clean and unclean animals)	" 11^{2-23} 20^{25}
$22^{30 (31)}$	14^{21a} (food improperly killed)	" 17^{15} 11^{40}
23^{19b} 34^{26b}	14^{21b} (kid in mother's milk)	
	14^{22-29} (tithes)	" 27^{30-33} Nu. 18^{21-32*}
$23^{10f.*}$	15^{1-11} (year of Release)	" 25^{1-7*}

* *L.O.T.* pp. 43–55, 141–144.

Digitized by Google

JE.	DEUTERONOMY.	P (INCLUDING H).
Ex. 21^{2-11*}	15^{12-18} (Hebrew slaves)	Lev. 25^{39-46*}
$22^{29\,(30)}$ 13^{12} 34^{19}	15^{19-23} (firstlings of ox and sheep: cf. $12^{6.\,17.\,18}$ 14^{23})	Nu. $18^{17f.*}$ (cf. Ex. $13^{1f.}$ Lev. 27^{26} Nu. 3^{13} 8^{17})
23^{14-17} $34^{18.\,20\,end.\,22-24}$	16^{1-17} (the three annual Pilgrimages)	Lev. 23^{*} Nu. 28–29^{*}
	16^{18} (appointment of judges)	
$23^{1-3.\,6-8}$	16^{19-20} (just judgment)	" 19^{15}
	16^{21-22} (Ashérahs and "pillars" prohibited)	" 26^{1}
	17^{1} (sacrifices to be without blemish: cf. 15^{21})	" 22^{17-24}
$22^{19\,(20)}$ 20^{3} 23^{13} 34^{14}	17^{2-7} (worship of "other gods," or of the host of heaven)	
	17^{8-13} (supreme tribunal)	
	17^{14-20} (law of the king)	
	18^{1-8} (rights and revenues of the tribe of Levi)	" 7^{32-34*} Nu. $18^{1-7.\,8-20*}$
	18^{9-22} (law of the prophet)	
	18^{10a} (Molech-worship: cf. 12^{31})	" 18^{21} 20^{2-5}
$22^{17\,(18)}$ (sorceress alone)	18^{10b-11} (different kinds of divination and magic)	" $19^{26b.\,31}$ $20^{6.\,27}$
21^{12-14*}	19^{1-13} (asylum for manslayer: murder)	Nu. 35^{9-34} Lev. $24^{17.\,21}$
	19^{14} (the landmark)	
23^{1}	19^{15-21} (law of witness)	Lev. 19^{16b}
	c. 20 (military service and war: cf. 24^{5})	
	21^{1-9} (expiation of an untraced murder)	
	21^{10-14} (treatment of female captives)	
	21^{15-17} (primogeniture)	
cf. $21^{15.\,17}$	21^{18-21} (undutiful son)	cf. Lev. 20^{9}
	21^{22-23} (body of malefactor)	
23^{4-5}	22^{1-4} (animals straying or fallen: lost property)	
	22^{5} (sexes not to interchange garments)	
	22^{6-7} (bird's nest)	
	22^{8} (battlement)	
	22^{9-11} (against non-natural mixtures)	Lev. 19^{19}
	22^{12} (law of "tassels")	Nu. 15^{37-41}

Digitized by Google

JE.	Deuteronomy.	P (including H).
	22^{13-21} (slander against a newly-married maiden)	
Ex. 20^{14}	22^{22-27} (adultery)	Lev. 18^{20} 20^{10}
$22^{15 (16) f.}$	$22^{28f.}$ (seduction)	
	23^{1}(22^{30}) (incest with stepmother)	" 18^{8} 20^{11}
	$23^{2-9 (1-8)}$ (conditions of admittance into the theocratic community)	
	$23^{10-15 (9-14)}$ (cleanliness in the camp)	Nu. 5^{1-4*}
	$23^{16 (15) f.}$ (humanity to escaped slave)	
	$23^{18 (17) f.}$ (against religious prostitution)	
$22^{24 (25)}$	$23^{20 (19) f.}$ (usury)	Lev. 25^{35-37}
	$23^{22-24 (21-23)}$ (vows)	Nu. 30^{2}
	$23^{25 (24) f.}$ (regard for neighbour's crops)	
	24^{1-4} (divorce)	
$22^{25 (26) f.}$	$24^{6.\ 10-13}$ (pledges)	
21^{16}	24^{7} (man-stealing)	
	$24^{8f.}$ (leprosy)	Lev. 13–14
	$24^{14f.}$ (wages of hired servant not to be detained)	" 19^{13}
	24^{16} (the family of a criminal not to suffer with him)	
$22^{20-23 (21-24)}$ 23^{9}	$24^{17f.}$ (justice towards stranger, widow, and orphan)	" $19^{33f.}$
	24^{19-22} (gleanings)	" $19^{9f.}$ 23^{22}
	25^{1-3} (moderation in infliction of the bastinado)	
	25^{4} (threshing ox not to be muzzled)	
	25^{5-10} (levirate-marriage)	
	25^{11-12} (modesty in women)	
	25^{13-16} (just weights)	" $19^{35f.}$
17^{14}	25^{17-19} ('Amaleḳ!)	
cf. $22^{28a (29a)}$ 23^{19a} 34^{26a}	26^{1-11} (thanksgiving at the offering of firstfruits)	cf. Nu. $18^{12f.}$
	26^{12-15} (thanksgiving at the payment of the triennial tithe)	
23^{20-33}	c. 28 (peroration, presenting motives for the observance of the Code)	Lev. 26^{3-45}

Digitized by Google

JE.	DEUTERONOMY.	P (INCLUDING H).
Ex. $20^{4.23}$ 34^{17}	$4^{16-18.23}$ 7^{25} (against images)	Lev. 19^{4b} 26^{1}
23^{12b}	5^{14b} (philanthropic object of Sabbath)	
cf. $13^{9.16}$	6^{8} 11^{18} (law of frontlets)	
20^{3} 23^{13} 34^{14}	6^{14} 11^{16} (against "other gods")	" 19^{4a}
13^{14}	$6^{20f.}$ (instruction to children)	
$23^{24a.32f.}$ $34^{12.15f.}$	$7^{2-4.16}$ (no compact with Canaanites)	Nu. 33^{55}
23^{24b} 34^{13}	7^{5} 12^{3} (Canaanite altars, "pillars" &c. to be destroyed)	" 33^{52}
19^{6} $22^{29(30)}$	7^{6} $14^{2.21}$ 26^{19} 28^{9} (Israel a "holy people") (in different connexions)	Lev. $11^{44f.}$ 19^{2} $20^{7.26}$ Nu. 15^{40}
$22^{20(21)}$ 23^{9}	10^{19} (to love the "stranger")	" 19^{34}
	$12^{16.23}$ 15^{23} (blood not to be eaten)	" 17^{10-14} 19^{26a} (cf. 3^{17} $7^{26f.}$ Gn. 9^{4})
23^{18a} 34^{25a}	16^{3a} (leavened bread not to be eaten with Passover)	Ex. 12^{8}
$13^{6f.}$ 23^{15} 34^{18}	$16^{3b.4a.8}$ (unleavened cakes for seven days afterwards)	" $12^{15.18-20}$ Lev. 23^{6}
23^{18b} 34^{25b}	16^{4b} (flesh of Passover not to remain till morning)	" 12^{10} Nu. 9^{12}
	$16^{13.15}$ (feast of "booths"; "seven days")	Lev. $23^{34.39.41-43}$
	17^{6} 19^{15} ("two or three witnesses")	Nu. 35^{30}
21^{23-25}	19^{21} (*lex talionis*) (but in a different application in each case)	Lev. $24^{19f.}$
20^{25}	27^{5-6} (altars of unhewn stones)	

There are also in Ex. 20–23 and Lev. 17–26 prohibitions corresponding to most of the imprecations in 27^{15-26}; see the Table, p. 299.*

The passages should in all cases be examined individually; for sometimes, especially in the case of those cited from P, the parallelism extends only to the subject-matter, the details being different, or even actually discrepant. The instances in which the divergence is most marked are indicated by an asterisk (*); for a discussion of the differences the reader is referred to the Commentary.

* On the principle, so far as it is systematic, on which the laws in c. 12–26 are arranged, see p. 135 f.

Digitized by Google

A detailed study of these parallels leads at once to an important result: it makes it apparent, *viz.* that the legislation of Dt. is *differently related to each of the three other Codes.* (1) The laws of JE *form the foundation* of the Deuteronomic legislation. This is evident as well from the numerous *verbal coincidences,** as from the fact, which is plain from the left-hand column, that nearly the whole ground covered by Ex. 20^{22}–23^{33} is included in it, almost the only exception being the special compensations to be paid for various injuries (Ex. 21^{18}–$22^{16\,(15)}$), which would be less necessary in a manual intended for the people.† In a few cases the entire law is repeated *verbatim,*‡ or nearly so; § elsewhere only particular clauses: ‖ in other cases the older law is expanded, fresh definitions being added, or its principle extended, or parenetic comments attached, or the law is virtually recast in the Deuteronomic phraseology.

Thus c. 13 and 17^{2-7} may be regarded as expansions, with reference to particular cases, of the law against idolatry in Ex. $22^{19\,(20)}$; 15^{1-6} a new institution is attached to the fallow seventh year of Ex. $23^{10f.}$; 15^{12-18} (the law of slavery) is based upon Ex. 21^{2-7}, but with considerable modifications, and with parenetic additions (v.$^{13-15.\,18}$); 15^{19-23} (firstlings) specializes, and at the same time modifies, Ex. $13^{11f.}$ $22^{29\,(30)}$ 34^{19}; 16^{1-17} (the three Pilgrimages) expands Ex. 23^{14-17} (=$34^{18.\,20b.\,22-25}$), by the addition of regulations partly new, partly derived from Ex. $13^{3.\,6}$, and of parenetic comments; $16^{19f.}$ (just judgment) partly repeats, partly expands, Ex. $23^{6.\,8}$; $18^{10f.}$ (against divination and sorcery) extends the principle of Ex. $22^{17\,(18)}$ (sorceress alone) to analogous cases; 19^{1-13} (asylum for manslaughter; and murder) is a new and extended application of the principles laid down

---

* Specimens may be seen transcribed in the notes on $15^{12.\,16-17}$ $16^{3-4.\,8.\,10.\,13.\,15.\,16}$ 22^{1-4}.

† The other exceptions are Ex. $20^{25f.}$ $22^{29\,(28).\,30\,(29)b}$.

‡ "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk" (14^{21b}=Ex. 23^{19b}=Ex. 34^{26b}).

§ 7^5 But thus shall ye do to them : *their altars ye shall pull down, and their obelisks ye shall break in pieces, and their Ashérahs ye shall* hew down, and their graven images ye shall burn with fire (cf. 12^3).	Ex. 34^{13} But *their altars ye shall pull down, and their obelisks ye shall break in pieces, and their Ashérahs ye shall* cut down.

See also $16^{4.\,8.\,16.\,19}$ 25^{19b} (pp. ix, 192, 194, 198, 288).

‖ *E.g.* 6^8 ("for a sign upon thine hand, and . . . for frontlets between thine eyes"); 7^2 ("thou shalt not make a covenant with them": see Ex. 23^{32}); also $15^{12.\,16-17}$ $16^{3.\,10}$ 22^{1-4} (pp. 181 f., 192, 196, 249).

Digitized by Google

in Ex. 21^{12-14}; 19^{16-21} (the law of witness) of those of Ex. 23^{1} 21^{24}; 22^{1-3} while agreeing substantially with Ex. 23^{4} (a lost ox or ass to be restored to its owner), extends in v.$^{2.\,3b}$ the principle of the older law to cases of other lost property; 22^{23-29} (seduction) defines with greater precision (v.$^{28f.}$) the law of Ex. $22^{15f.\,(16f.)}$, and adds provisions (v.$^{23-27}$) for two other cases of the same crime; $23^{20f.}$ (interest) accentuates, and impresses with a new motive, Ex. $22^{24\,(25)}$, as $24^{6.\,10-13}$ (pledges) does similarly for Ex. $22^{25f.\,(26f.)}$; the general regard for the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, inculcated in Ex. $22^{20-23\,(21-24)}$, determines in Dt. the form of an entire series of philanthropic regulations ($16^{11.\,14}$ $24^{17.\,19.\,20.\,21}$ $26^{12.\,13}$ 27^{19}; cf. 10^{18}).

The style of the Book of the Covenant is concise, the laws being usually formulated in as few words as possible, and parenetic additions being rare ($22^{20b.\,22-23b.\,26b\,(21b.\,23-24b.\,27b)}$ 23^{9}). In Dt., on the other hand, even where the substance is the same, the law is usually expanded; and the parenetic element is considerable.

The following parallels will illustrate the manner in which a thought, or command, expressed briefly in Ex., is expanded in Dt. :—

7^{14} Blessed shalt thou be above all peoples: there shalt not be in thee male or *female barren*, or in thy cattle. [15] And Jehovah will remove from thee all sickness; and *none* of the evil diseases of Egypt, which thou knowest, *will* he *lay upon thee*, but he will put them upon all them that hate thee.	Ex. 23^{26} There shall not be a *female* casting her young, or *barren*, in thy land. Ex. 15^{26} If thou hearkenest &c. . . ., *none* of the sicknesses, which I have laid upon the Egyptians, *will* I *lay upon thee*.
[16] And thou shalt devour all the peoples which Jehovah thy God is giving to thee; thine eye shall not pity them; neither *shalt thou serve their gods, for* that (will be) *a snare to thee*.	Ex. 23^{33} They shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee sin against me; for *thou wilt* (then) *serve their gods, for* it will be *a snare to thee*.
16^{19} *Thou shalt not wrest judgment*: thou shalt not acknowledge persons: *thou shalt not take a bribe; for a bribe blindeth* the eyes of the wise, *and subverteth the cause of the just*. [20] Justice, justice shalt thou pursue; that thou mayest live, and inherit the land which Jehovah thy God is giving thee.	Ex. 23^{6} *Thou shall not wrest* the *judgment* of thy poor in his cause. [8] *And a bribe thou shalt not take; for a bribe blindeth* the open-eyed, *and subverteth the cause of the just*.

In these additions, the strongly-marked Deuteronomic style (§ 5) is nearly always observable (on 16^{20b}, cf. also p. xxxiii, *note*).

In some cases the law of Ex. is so modified in Dt. as to necessitate the conclusion (p. xxxviii) that in its Deuteronomic form it springs from a considerably later, and more developed, state of society; but these modifications do not affect the

Digitized by Google

truth of the general position that the legislation of Dt. is essentially *based upon* that of JE in Exodus. Dt. 5–11 is a parenetic expansion of the First Commandment of the Decalogue; Dt. 12–26 is an enlarged edition of the "Book of the Covenant" (Ex. 20^{22}–23^{33}), and the kindred laws in Ex. $13^{8\text{-}16}$ $34^{10\text{-}26}$, characterized by a considerable increase in the parenetic element, and containing many new civil and social enactments, designed (like the modifications just noted) to provide for cases likely to arise in a more complex and highly-organized community than is contemplated in the legislation of JE in Exodus.

(2) In the right-hand column, the great majority of parallels are with the "Law of Holiness."* If the cases are examined individually, it will be found that they are less systematic and complete than those with JE, and that in particular, even where the substance is similar, the expression is nearly always different, and is decidedly less marked than in the case of the parallels with JE (where the nucleus of the law, however much expanded in Dt., is often to be found *verbatim* in Exodus).

The following are specimens: the resemblances, it will be observed, never extend beyond one or two common terms, which so belong to the subject-matter of the law, that their occurrence in both could hardly be avoided:—

Dt. 14^{1} Sons are ye to Jehovah your God: ye shall not cut yourselves, nor put baldness between your eyes, for the dead.	Lev. 19^{28} And lacerations for a (dead) soul ye shall not make in your flesh; neither shall ye make tattooings in you: I am Jehovah.
16^{19} Thou shalt not wrest *judgment*: thou shalt not acknowledge (תכיר) *persons*: thou shalt not take a bribe; for a bribe blindeth the eyes of the wise, and subverteth the cause of the just [see Ex. 23^{8}].	19^{15} Ye shall not do unrighteousness in *judgment*; thou shalt not accept (תשא) the *person* of the poor, nor honour the *person* of the great:
^{20} *Justice*, justice shalt thou pursue; that thou mayest live, and inherit the land which Jehovah thy God is giving thee.	in *justice* shalt thou judge thy fellow-kinsman (עמיתך).
24^{19} When thou *reapest* thine *harvest* in the field, and forgettest a	19^{9} And when ye *reap* the *harvest* of your land, thou shalt not wholly

* Which includes, not only the greater part of Lev. 17–26, but also, probably, Lev. $11^{2\text{-}23}$ Nu. $15^{37\text{-}41}$ $33^{52f.\ 55f.}$ (*L.O.T.* p. 54).

Digitized by Google

sheaf in the *field*, thou shalt not return to take it: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow; that Jehovah thy God may bless thee in all the work of thy hands. 20 When thou beatest thine olive-tree, thou shalt not do the boughs (again) after thee: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow. 21 When thou gatherest *thy vineyard, thou shalt not glean* (תעולל) it after thee: it shall be *for the stranger*, for the fatherless, and for the widow. 22 And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt [5^{15} 15^{15} 16^{12} 24^{18}]; therefore I command thee to do this thing [v.^{18}; cf. 15^{15}].

reap the corner of thy *field*; neither shalt thou pick up the pickings of thine harvest (ולקט קצירך לא תלקט).

10 And *thy vineyard thou shalt not glean* (תעולל); neither shalt thou pick up the fallings of thy vineyard (ופרט כרמך לא תלקט); thou shalt leave them for the poor, and *for the stranger*: I am Jehovah thy God.

See also Dt. 22^{9-11} and Lev. 19^{19}, transcribed on p. 252.

It follows that the legislation of Dt. cannot be said to be based upon this Code, or connected with it organically, as it is with the code of JE: the laws of Dt. and H are frequently *parallel* in substance, they must therefore be derived ultimately from some common source, but they are formulated without reference to each other. There is only one exception to what has been stated, viz. the law of clean and unclean animals in Dt. 14^{3-20}, which presents undoubtedly, in the main (see pp. 157–159), a remarkable verbal parallel with Lev. 11^{2-23} (if this be referred rightly to H, rather than to P): the section, it is plain, must have been derived directly either from H, or from an older collection of priestly *Tôrôth* (pp. 208, 275, 401 f.), the immediate source (in this case) of both H and Dt.

(3) With the other parts of Ex.–Nu., the "Priests' Code" properly so called, the parallelism of Dt. is both much less frequent, and (where it is present) much less complete, even than with the "Law of Holiness." There are *no* verbal parallels between Dt. and P; much that is of central significance in the system of P is ignored in Dt., while in the laws which touch common ground, great, and indeed irreconcilable, discrepancies often display themselves: hence the legislation

Digitized by Google

of P cannot be considered in any degree to have been one of the sources employed by the author of Dt.

Several of the institutions, or observances, codified in P are, it is true, mentioned in Dt.; but the allusions are of a kind resembling those in JE and other early Heb. writers:* they seldom, if ever, presuppose the distinctive regulations of P, or, *in the light of the silence, or contradiction, observable in other cases*, are such as to establish the writer's use of P, as we now have it. The following are the instances which should be noted:—

Aaron, the founder of a hereditary priesthood (10^{6}); burnt- and peace-offerings (12$^{6.11.13.14.27}$ 18^{3} 27$^{6.7}$: so Ex. 20^{24} 24^{5} 1 S. 10^{8}, and constantly in the early historical books), with a brief notice of the ritual accompanying them (12^{27}: see note); tithes (12$^{6.11.17}$ 14$^{22-29}$ 26^{12}: Am. 4^{4}); "heave"-offerings (12^{6} [see note]$^{11.17}$: ? 2 S. 1^{21}); vows (12$^{6.11.17.26}$ 23$^{19.22-24\,(18.21-23)}$: 2 S. 15$^{7.8}$ *al.*); free-will offerings (12$^{6.17}$ 16^{10}; ? 23^{24}: Am. 4^{5}); sanctity of firstlings (12$^{6.17}$ 14^{23} 15^{19}: Ex. 22$^{29\,(30)}$); and of firstfruits (18^{4} 26$^{2.10}$: Ex. 23^{19}); the distinction of "clean" and "unclean," in persons (12$^{15.22}$ 15^{22}: 1 S. 20^{26}), in food (14$^{3-20}$: Gn. 7^{2} [JE] Jud. 13^{4} Hos. 9^{3}), produced by particular causes (21^{23} [Nu. 35^{34}], 23$^{11\,(10)\text{f.}}$ [Lev. 15^{16}], 24^{4} [Lev. 18^{20} Nu. 5^{13}], 26^{14} [Nu. 19$^{11.14}$: Hos. 9^{4}]); the prohibition to eat blood (12^{23}: 1 S. 14$^{33\text{ff.}}$); and to eat *nebēlāh*, the flesh of an animal dying of itself (14^{21}); holy, or dedicated, things (12^{26} [see note], 26^{13}); animals offered in sacrifice to be without blemish (15^{21} 17^{1}); the *'aṣéreth* or "solemn assembly" (16^{8}: cf. Am. 5^{21} Is. 1^{13}; and see note); priestly rights of the tribe of Levi (18$^{1-8}$ *al.*); "fire-sacrifices" (18^{1}: 1 S. 2^{28}); the "avenger of blood" (19$^{6.12}$: 2 S. 14^{11}); the atoning efficacy of a sacrificial rite, though *not* of one prescribed in P (21^{8b}†: cf. 1 S. 3^{14} Is. 22^{14}); a *tôrāh* for leprosy (24^{8}).

Notice also the expressions, *to hold* (עשה) the sabbath (5^{15}: so Ex. 31^{16} H), or a feast (16^{1} [see note]$^{10.13}$); *to do* (עשה), in a sacrificial sense (12^{27}: 1 K. 8^{64} 2 K. 10^{24}); *to profane* (חלל) or *treat as common*, a vineyard, of first enjoying its fruit (20^{6} 28^{30}: so Jer. 31^{5}; the *word*, however, is not found, in this application, in P or H, but cf. the opp. *holy* in Lev. 19^{24} H); *to be forfeited*, lit. *to become holy* (22^{9}: Lev. 27$^{10.21}$; but cf. in JE Jos. 6^{19}); 24^{8} נגע הצרעת; 25^{16} עשה עול *to do unrighteousness* (an unusual phrase: see note): שמר משמרתו *to keep his charge* (11^{1}), עשה מלאכה *to do work* (16^{8}), and *utterance of the lips* (23$^{24\,(23)}$), are less distinctive (see notes). Perhaps also Dillm. is right (pp. 605, 608 f.) in seeing in 12^{23} ("to eat the soul with the flesh), 14^{1} ("cut yourselves," and "for the dead"), 14^{3} ("abomination"), 14$^{10.19}$ ("unclean"), 16$^{4.6}$ ("in the evening,"—P "between the two evenings"), explanations of more technical priestly terms.

* See *L.O.T.* p. 135 f.

† In 21^{8a} (see note; also p. 425 f.), 32^{43} the subject of כפר ("clear") is not (as in P) the priest (annulling the sin by means of an atoning rite) but *Jehovah*: hence a sacrificial rite is not here denoted by the term.

Digitized by Google

On the other side, there must be remembered the serious contradictions between many of these provisions (especially those relating to the position and privileges of the priestly tribe), and the regulations of P (p. xxxix), and the complete silence of Dt. respecting some of the principles and institutions which are of fundamental importance in the system of P. The "Tent of Meeting," with its appurtenances, which figures so largely in P (Ex. 25–31. 35–40,—together with many allusions elsewhere); the distinction between the priests, the sons of Aaron, and the common "Levites," so often and emphatically insisted on in the same source; the Levitical cities, and the year of Jubile; the elaborately developed sacrificial *system* of P; the meal-offering (מנחה), the guilt-offering (אשם), and especially the sin-offering (חטאת)—all these are never mentioned in Dt.: * the atoning efficacy of sacrifice, on which such stress is laid in the sacrificial laws of P, is alluded to *once* in Dt. (21^{8b} †), and that in a law for which which there is in P no parallel; the great Day of Atonement (Lev. 16), in which the Levitical system of sacrifice and purification (Lev. 1–15) culminates, is in Dt. passed by in silence. Of course, in a discourse addressed to the people, and representing the prophetical and spiritual, rather than the priestly and ceremonial point of view, ***detailed*** references to such institutions, or a repetition of the directions for their observance, would not be expected: but, even if the document describing them existed at the time when Dt. was written, —a question with which we are not here concerned,—it is clear that the writer did not attach any great importance to it, or treat it practically as one of his sources. Had he so treated it, and especially if it had possessed in his eyes a recognized authority and importance, it is incredible that his references

* The Tent of Meeting is mentioned in Dt. $31^{14f.}$, but in a passage belonging not to D, but to JE (p. 337 f.). Nor, even there, does it appear as the centre of a great sacrificial organization. The non-mention of the sin-offering beside the burnt- and peace-offering in $12^{6.11}$ is very remarkable. (That it is not included in the term *ẓebaḥ*, "sacrifice," is clear from 12^{27b}; cf. on v.[6].) It is also singular that *ḳorbān*, P's very common, and most general term for *offering* (including sacrifices), never occurs in Dt.

† On 21^{8a} 32^{43}, see p. xii, *note*.

Digitized by Google

to it should not have been more systematic and exact. As it is, he moves on, without displaying the smallest concern or regard for the system of P: such institutions of P as he refers to are mentioned almost incidentally, without any sense of the significance attaching to them in the system of which they form part; and many of P's most characteristic and fundamental institutions, if they are not contradicted in Dt., are simply ignored in it. There can be no doubt that the author of Dt. was acquainted with priestly laws and institutions; but the nature of his allusions shows that his knowledge of them was derived, not from the systematic exposition of them contained in P, but from his practical acquaintance with the form in which they were operative in Israel in his own day; and this in many particulars differed materially from the regulations laid down in P.*

The different relation in which Dt. thus stands to the three Codes of JE, H, and P, may be described generally as follows: it is an *expansion* of the laws in JE (Ex. 20^{22}–23^{33} $34^{10\text{-}26}$ $13^{3\text{-}16}$); it is, in several features, *parallel to* the Law of Holiness; it contains *allusions* to laws—not, indeed, always the same as, but—similar to the ceremonial institutions and observances codified in the rest of P.†

The dependence of Dt. upon JE, on the one hand, and its *in*dependence of P, on the other, which is thus established for the legislative sections of the book, is maintained, in exactly the same manner, through the *historical* sections. Dt. contains two retrospects of the earlier stages of the Israelites' wanderings, one (1^{6}–3^{29}) embracing the period from their departure from Ḥoreb to their arrival in the land of Moab; the other (9^{8}–10^{11}), the episode of the Golden Calf, and the

* In 24^{8}, it may be observed, the reference is not to any *written* regulations on leprosy, but to the oral—though authorized (כאשר צויתים: p. 275)—"direction" of the priests. (Of course, the ceremonial usages alluded to by D must not be imagined to be the *only* ones current in his day.)

† The real explanation of this apparently anomalous peculiarity in the relation of Dt. to the preceding books of the Pent.—its dependence upon one set of passages, while it ignores another—is of course to be found in the fact that, at the time when Dt. was composed, the two sets of passages (JE and P) were *not yet combined into a single work*, and the author only made use of JE.

Digitized by Google

events immediately following it (Ex. 32–34); there are also several incidental allusions to other occurrences narrated in Gn.–Nu. In the retrospects, the narrative of Ex. Nu. is followed step by step, and clauses, or sometimes entire verses, are transcribed from it *verbatim*, placing beyond the possibility of doubt the use by the writer of the earlier narrative of the Pent. All the passages thus followed, or transcribed, belong to parts of Ex. Nu. which are referred (upon independent grounds) to JE; even where (as is sometimes the case) JE and P cross each other repeatedly in the course of a few verses, the retrospect in Dt. follows uniformly the parts belonging to JE, and avoids those belonging to P.* The case is similar with the other historical allusions in Dt.

Of these the principal are—

1^{8} (and frequently) the *oath* to the patriarchs	Gn. 15^{16} $22^{16f.}$ 24^{7} 26^{8}
4^{3} (Ba'al Pe'or)	Nu. 25^{1-5}
$4^{10ff.}$ $5^{2ff.}$ 18^{16} (delivery of Decalogue &c.)	Ex. 19^{3}–20^{21}
6^{16} (Massah)	Ex. 17^{7}
$6^{21f.}$ and elsewhere (deliverance from Egypt)	Ex. 13^{14} 14^{30}
$8^{3.\,16}$ (the manna)	Ex. 16^{4-5}
8^{15} (fiery serpents; and rock (צור) of flint)	Nu. 21^{6} and Ex. 17^{6}†
9^{22} (Tab'ĕrāh, Massah, Ḳibroth-hattá'ăvah)	Nu. 11^{1-3} Ex. 17^{7} Nu. 11^{34}
11^{4} (passage of the Red Sea)	Ex. 14^{27}
11^{6} (Dathan and Abiram)	Nu. $16^{1b.\,27b.\,30.\,32a}$
$23^{5f.\,(4f.)}$ (Bala'am)	Nu. 22^{2}–24^{25}
24^{9} (Miriam's leprosy)	Nu. 12^{10}
25^{17-19} (opposition of 'Amaleḳ)	Ex. 17^{8-16}
26^{6-8} (affliction and deliverance from Egypt)	Ex. $1^{9.\,12}$ $3^{7.\,9}$ &c.
$29^{22\,(23)}$ (overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrha)	Gn. $19^{24f.}$

Notice also the use of the name *Ḥoreb* (not Sinai), $1^{2.\,6.\,19}$ $4^{10.\,15}$ 5^{2} 9^{8} 18^{16}

* The Tables in the notes (pp. 10, 19, 24, 29, 33, 42, 46, 51, 112), and the extracts printed on pp. 113 f., 117, will, it is hoped, assist the reader to appreciate the manner in which the retrospects of Dt. are dependent upon JE in Ex. Nu. In order properly to realize the nature and extent of the coincidences, he should mark in the margin of his copy of Dt. the references, and underline (or, if he uses the Hebrew text, *over*line) the words in common: he will then be able to see at a glance both the passages of Ex. Nu. passed over in Dt., and the variations and additions in Dt. On a clause in 1^{39}, which has been supposed to be an exception to the statement in the text, see the note *ad loc.*

† In Nu. 20^{8-11} (P) the term for "rock" is סלע, not צור.

Digitized by Google

28^{69} (29^{1}), as Ex. 3^{1} 17^{6} 33^{6} (E); 1^{24} the valley of Eshcol as the limit of the spies' reconnoitring; 1^{36} the exemption of Caleb alone (without Joshua, who is not mentioned as one of the spies) from the sentence passed on the spies; 11^{30} the name *Terebinths of Moreh* (Gn. 12^{6}). The numerous passages referred to by the words *As Jehovah spake* (p. lxxxi), where they are not earlier passages of Dt. itself, are also regularly to be found in JE, not in P. (That 18^{2} cannot refer to Nu. 18^{20} is shown on 10^{9}. The reference is occasionally to a passage not preserved in our existing Pent.: cf. $10^{8.9}$ 17^{16} 28^{68}.) On $33^{8.9}$, see the notes *ad loc.*

Of the incidents here enumerated, all are narrated in JE; while in the case of some which are narrated in P as well, the terms of the allusion in Dt. are such as to show that the Writer followed JE, and not P. Thus, while the promise of 1^{8} is found in both JE and P, the *oath* is peculiar to JE; the name *Ḥoreb* is used by E, but not by P (who always prefers *Sinai*); the spies, as in JE (Nu. $13^{23f.}$), journey only as far as Eshcol (near Ḥebron), whereas in P (Nu. 13^{21}) they go as far as Reḥob (in the extreme north of Canaan); the exemption of Caleb alone (1^{36}) agrees with the representation of JE (Nu. 14^{24}) against that of P (Nu. $14^{6.30.38}$), where Joshua is mentioned at the same time; the mention of Dathan and Abiram (without Ḳoraḥ) is in agreement with JE's narrative in Nu. 16, which also names Dathan and Abiram only (the passages which speak of Ḳoraḥ belonging to P). There are only *three* facts mentioned in Dt. for which no parallel is to be found in JE: 1^{23} the number (twelve) of the spies (Nu. $13^{2\text{-}16}$ P); 10^{22} the number of souls (seventy) with which Jacob came down into Egypt (Gn. 46^{27} Ex. 1^{5} P); and 10^{3} acacia-wood as the material of the Ark (Ex. 25^{10} P). These coincidences, however, in view of the constancy with which the historical parts of Dt. are dependent upon JE, are not sufficient to establish the use of P: the three facts mentioned would not be invented by P, but would be elements of tradition, which though they happen to be recorded (apart from Dt.) only by P, would naturally be known independently to the Writer of Dt. And as regards Dt. 10^{3}, in particular, a comparison of Dt. $10^{1\text{-}3}$ with Ex. $34^{1.2.4}$ makes it highly probable that the latter passage, at the time when Dt. was composed, still contained a notice of the ark of acacia-wood (see p. 117 f.).*

* $10^{6f.}$ the *names* are (substantially) the same as those in P's itinerary,

Digitized by Google

The author's method in treating the history of JE is analogous to that followed by him in dealing with the laws. His references to it have mostly a didactic aim: hence they are accompanied usually by parenetic comments, designed to bring home to the Israelite reader the theocratic significance of the history, and to arouse in him emotions of becoming gratitude towards the divine Leader and Benefactor of his nation. Of the two retrospects, the first illustrates Jehovah's goodness in bringing Israel safely from Egypt to the borders of the Promised Land; the second exemplifies His forbearance and mercy in restoring it to favour after the sin of the Golden Calf. Accordingly, while numerous passages, longer or shorter, as the case may be, are incorporated *verbatim*, as a rule the substance of the earlier narrative is reproduced freely, with amplificatory additions calculated (in most cases) to suggest to the reader the lessons which the author desired it to teach.* Of this kind are the comments, summaries, or short speeches (such as $1^{6-8.\ 18.\ 20.\ 21.\ 27.\ 29-33.\ 43a.\ 45}$ $2^{7.\ 24-25.\ 30b.\ 31.\ 33.\ 36-37}$ $3^{3a.\ 4-7}$), which have the effect in different ways of calling attention to Jehovah's purposes, or dealings, with Israel, and to the manner in which Israel responded to them. But in other cases the additions are of a more substantial character, and mention incidents of some interest or importance, not noticed in the narrative of JE. Thus (including two or three from other parts of Dt.) we find of the latter kind—

1^{9-13} (*Moses* suggests the appointment of assistant judges); 1^{16-17} (Moses' counsel to the judges); 1^{22} (the proposal to send out spies emanates from the *people*); 1^{37} (Moses punished for the *people's* fault; so 3^{26} 4^{21}); $2^{2-7.\ 9.\ 18-19}$ (Israel forbidden to make war with Edom, Moab, and

---

Nu. 33^{31-33}; but they are mentioned in a different order, and the *form* of the itinerary differs from that of P (see the notes): hence the notice (from whatever source it may have been taken) will certainly not have been derived from P. In $11^{4.\ 5}$ *host* (חיל), *horses and chariots*, and *pursued after them*, are points of contact with P's narrative of the passage of the Red Sea in Ex. 14 (see v.$^{4.\ 9.\ 17b.\ 18b.\ 23b.\ 28a}$); comp. 16^{3} *trepidation* (Ex. 12^{11}), 26^{6} *hard bondage* (see note), 26^{8} *stretched out arm* (Ex. 6^{6}: cf. on 4^{34}), *to be to thee for a God* (26^{17} $29^{12\,(13)}$) and *to be to Jehovah for a people* (27^{9}; see on $26^{17.\ 18}$), and the words from c. 4, cited on p. lxxi: but it may be questioned whether these expressions are not too isolated, and too little distinctive, to establish dependence upon P (cf. also *L.O.T.* pp. 138, 143).

* Notice *and, now*, 4^{1} (after the retrospect, c. 1–3), 10^{12} (after 9^{7}–10^{11}).

Digitized by Google

the ʻAmmonites); $2^{10-12.\,20-23}$ $3^{9.\,11.\,13b}$ (archæological notices); 2^{26} (messengers to Siḥon sent out from the wilderness of Ḳedēmoth); 2^{29} (how the Edomites and Moabites had furnished the Israelites with food); 2^{33b} (slaughter of Siḥon's sons); 3^{4b-5} (description of the region of Argob, taken from ʻOg); 3^{21-22} (Moses encouragement of Joshua); 3^{23-28} (Moses' entreaty to be permitted to enter Canaan); 9^{20} (Moses' intercession for Aaron, after his sin in making the Golden Calf); 9^{21} (the dust of the Golden Calf cast into the stream that descended from the mount); 10^{6} (death of Aaron at *Mosērah*); $10^{8f.}$ (separation of the tribe of Levi for priestly functions); 10^{9} 18^{2} (statement that Jehovah is the "inheritance" of the tribe of Levi); 17^{16} 28^{68} (promise that Israel should no more return to Egypt); 25^{18} (the fact that ʻAmaleḳ, when it met Israel at Rephidim, Ex. 17^{8-16}, cut off helpless stragglers in the rear).*

The graphic minor touches in 1^{27} "murmured in your tents," 1^{41} "girded on every one his weapons," 1^{44} "and pursued you as bees do," 1^{45} "wept before Jehovah," &c., are presumably merely elements in the author's picturesque presentation of the history.

The number of cases is also remarkable, in which a phrase, originally used in the description of one incident, is applied in Dt. to the description of another; in the Tables (pp. 10, 24, &c.) these are indicated by the passage quoted being enclosed in a parenthesis. The cases are—

Dt. 1^{7a} ("turn you and take your journey," borrowed from Nu. 14^{25}, though the occasion is quite a different one); 1^{9b} ("I cannot bear you alone," borrowed, not from Ex. 18, the occasion which is being described, but from Nu. 11^{14} "*I* cannot bear all this people alone": cf. v.^{12} with Nu. 11^{17b}); 1^{30a} (from Ex. 13^{21} 14^{14}); 1^{33} (from Ex. 13^{21} Nu. 14^{14b}); 1^{33a} (from Nu. 10^{33b}); 1^{46a} (Nu. 20^{1}); Dt. 2^{1b} (from Nu. 21^{4}); $2^{27b.\,28b}$ (phrases in the message to *Siḥon*, borrowed from Nu. $20^{17.\,19b}$ the message to *Edom*); $2^{32.\,33b}$ (description of Israel's encounter with *Siḥon*, borrowed from Nu. $21^{33.\,35}$ the description of the encounter with ʻOg: in this case, while Nu. mentions only the slaughter of ʻ*Og's* sons, Dt. mentions only the slaughter of those of *Siḥon*); 9^{9b} (Moses' fasting on the occasion of his *first* ascent of the mountain, from Ex. 34^{28a} his fasting on the occasion of his *third* ascent; the fasting on the first occasion is not mentioned in Ex.); $9^{26.\,27a\,29b}$ (from Ex. $32^{11b.\,13}$; though the occasion actually referred to is Ex. 34^{9}); 9^{28} (from Ex. 32^{12} Nu. 14^{16}); 10^{11} (cf. Ex. 33^{1}).—In some instances, the passages do not agree throughout *verbatim*; but the resemblance is always sufficiently close to leave no doubt that the passage quoted is the source of the terms used in Dt.

The bearing of the facts just noted on the authorship of the book will be considered subsequently; see p. xlviii.

The general result of the preceding examination of the relation of Dt. to the preceding books of the Pentateuch, has

* Cf. Dillm. p. 610; Westphal, pp. 89 f., 119.

Digitized by Google

been to establish this fact: in neither its historical nor its legislative sections can Dt. be shown to be dependent upon the source which has been termed P; in both, it is demonstrably dependent upon JE. The historical matter being of secondary importance in Dt., and c. 5–11 being a parenetic introduction, the legislative kernel of the book (c. 12–26. 28) may be described broadly as a *revised and enlarged edition of the "Book of the Covenant."* Why such a revision and enlargement of the Book of the Covenant was undertaken, and why the laws of Israel were thus embedded by the author in a homiletic comment, is a question which can only be fully answered in § 4, when the date and origin of the book have been approximately determined.

§ 3. *Scope and Character of Deuteronomy; its dominant Ideas.*

The Deuteronomic discourses may be said to comprise three elements, an *historical*, a *legislative*, and a *parenetic*. Of these the parenetic element is both the most characteristic and the most important; it is directed to the inculcation of certain fundamental religious and moral principles upon which the Writer lays great stress: the historical element is all but entirely subservient to it (the references to the history, as said before, having nearly always a didactic aim): the legislative element, though naturally, as the condition of national well-being, possessing an independent value of its own, is *here* viewed primarily by the Writer as a vehicle for exemplifying the principles which it is the main object of his book to enforce. The author wrote, it is evident, under a keen sense of the perils of idolatry; and to guard Israel against this by insisting earnestly on the debt of gratitude and obedience which it owes to its Sovereign Lord, is the fundamental teaching of the book. Accordingly, the truths on which he loves to dwell are the sole Godhead of Jehovah, His spirituality (c. 4), His choice of Israel, and the love and faithfulness which He has shown towards it, by redeeming it from its servitude in Egypt, by leading it safely through the desert, and by planting it in a land abundantly blessed by nature's bounty; from which

Digitized by Google

are deduced the great practical duties of loyal and loving devotion to Him, an absolute and uncompromising repudiation of all false gods, a cheerful and ready obedience to His will, a warm-hearted and generous attitude towards man, in all the various relations of life in which the Israelite is likely to be brought into contact with his neighbour. Jehovah alone is God; there is none beside Him ($4^{35.\ 39}$); He is the Almighty ruler of heaven and earth, "the God of gods and Lord of lords" ($10^{14.\ 17}$), who rewards both the righteous and the evil-doer as he deserves, and who governs all men with absolute impartiality and justice (7^{10} $10^{17f.}$). The central and principal discourse (c. 5–26. 28) opens with the Decalogue; and the First Commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," may be said to be the text, which in the rest of c. 5–11 is eloquently and movingly expanded. Jehovah is, moreover, a *spiritual* Being, dissimilar in kind to any and every material form: hence no sensible representation can be framed of Him; still less should Israel worship any other material object, whether some representation of the human or animal form, or even the host of heaven ($4^{12.\ 15\text{-}24}$). And Jehovah has *chosen* Israel. He has given to other nations the sun, moon, and stars to adore (4^{19}, cf. $29^{25\,(26)}$); He has reserved Israel for Himself; He has chosen it out of all peoples of the earth to be His own peculiar possession (4^{37} 7^{6} 10^{15} 14^{2} 26^{18}), the unique recipient of His self-revealing grace. And He has done this, not on account of Israel's merits, for neither its numbers nor its righteousness would constitute any claim upon Him for His regard (7^{7} $9^{4\text{-}6}$); but from His *love* for Israel (7^{8} $23^{6\,(5)}$), and from the faithfulness with which, in spite of all its back-slidings, He would nevertheless be true to the promise sworn to its forefathers (7^{8}; cf. 1^{8} $4^{31.\ 37.}$ 7^{12} 8^{18} *al.*), and forbear from destroying it (9^{7}–10^{11}). In fulfilment of that promise, Jehovah has wonderfully delivered Israel from its bondage in Egypt ($4^{32\text{-}38}$ $6^{21\text{-}23}$ $7^{18f.}$ $8^{2ff.}$ $11^{2\text{-}6}$, and frequently), He has led it safely through the great and terrible wilderness (1^{19} 2^{7} 8^{15}), He has assigned it a home in a bounteous and fertile land, which it is now on the point of crossing Jordan to take possession of ($6^{10f.}$ $8^{7\text{-}10.\ 12f.}$ *al.*). Jehovah has, in fact, dealt with Israel in

Digitized by Google

the manner of a loving father ($8^{2.3.16}$): if He has withheld aught from it, or subjected it to privations, it has been with a view to its ultimate welfare, "As a man disciplines his son, so doth Jehovah thy God discipline thee" (8^{5}). In return for all these benefits, it is the Israelite's duty to fear and love Jehovah, —to *fear* Him (4^{10} $5^{26(29)}$ $6^{2.13.24}$ 8^{6} $10^{12.20}$ $13^{5(4)}$ 14^{23} 17^{19} (of the king), 28^{58} $31^{12.13}$), as the great and mighty God (10^{17}), whose awe-inspiring manifestations strike terror into all beholders (4^{32-36} 10^{21} 11^{2-7} 26^{8}); and to *love* Him (6^{5} 10^{12} $11^{1.13.22}$ $13^{4(3)}$ 19^{9} $30^{6.16.20}$), on account of the affection and constancy with which He has condescended to deal with Israel, and the privileges, undeserved on its part, which He has vouchsafed to confer upon it. The love of God, an all-absorbing sense of personal devotion to Him, is propounded in Dt. as the primary spring of human action (6^{5}); it is the duty which is the direct corollary of the character of God, and of Israel's relation to Him; the Israelite is to love Him with undivided affection,* to "cleave" to Him (10^{20} 11^{22} $13^{5(4)}$ 30^{20}), to renounce everything that is in any degree inconsistent with loyalty to Him. This brings with it, on the one hand, an earnest and emphatic repudiation of all false gods, and of every rite or practice connected with idolatry; and, on the other hand, a cheerful and willing acquiescence in the positive commandments which He has laid down. Again and again is the Israelite warned, upon peril of the consequences, not to follow after "other gods" (6^{14-15} 7^{4} 8^{19-20} $11^{16-17.28}$ 30^{17-18}; cf. $29^{24-27(25-28)}$ $31^{16f.20f.}$ $4^{23f.25-28}$), not to be tempted, even by the most specious representations, to the practice of idolatry ($13^{2-12(1-11)}$): death is the penalty—and it is to be enforced, without hesitation or compunction, against even a nearest relative or a trusted friend ($13^{7-12(6-11)}$)—for any one who either practises idolatry himself, or seeks to induce others to do so ($13^{6(5).11(10)}$ 17^{5}, cf. 18^{20}); even though it be a whole city that has sinned by serving strange gods, it is not to be spared ($13^{13-19(12-18)}$). The heathen populations of Canaan are to be

* "With *all* the heart and *all* the soul" (with *love* 6^{5} $13^{4(3)}$ 30^{6}, *serve* 10^{12} 11^{13}, *keep and do commandments* 26^{16}, *listen to His voice* 30^{2}, *turn to Him* 30^{11}, *search after* in true penitence 4^{29}).

Digitized by Google

laid under the "ban" (see on 7^{2}), and exterminated ($7^{2-4. 16}$ 20^{16-18}): no truce is to be made with them; no intermarriage, or other intercourse with them, is to be permitted ($7^{2f.}$); their places of worship and religious symbols are to be ruthlessly destroyed (7^{5} $12^{2f.}$); even the metal which formed part of their idols is not to be put to any use by Israel ($7^{25f.}$). Nor is any attempt to be made to resuscitate the abolished religious rites (12^{29-31}), or to introduce features from them into the worship of Jehovah ($16^{21f.}$). Canaanitish forms of divination and magic are not to be tolerated (18^{9-12}): an authorized order of prophets is to supply in Israel, so far as Jehovah permits it, the information and counsel for which other nations resorted to augurs and soothsayers (18^{15-19}). Local shrines and altars, even though ostensibly dedicated to the worship of the true God, were liable to contamination, on the part of the unspiritual Israelites, by the admixture of heathen rites: accordingly, the three great annual feasts are to be observed, and all sacrifices and other religious dues are to be rendered, it is repeatedly and strongly insisted, at a single central sanctuary, "the place which Jehovah shall choose to set His name there" ($12^{5. 11. 14. 18. 21. 26}$, and elsewhere). The Writer is, however, conscious of the danger lest, in the enjoyment of the good things of Canaan, Israel should be tempted to forget the Giver, and yield on this ground, through thoughtlessness and neglect, to the seductions of idolatry: to guard therefore against this danger, He earnestly and emphatically forewarns them of the suicidal consequences of disobedience, assuring them that it will only end in national ruin and disgrace (6^{10-15} 8^{11-20} $11^{16f.}$ 31^{29}). Obedience to Jehovah's commands, on the other hand, if it come from the heart and be sincere, will be the sure avenue to national prosperity; it will bring with it Jehovah's blessing, and be the unfailing guarantee of "life," and "length of days," in the long-continued possession of the land of Canaan.* The consequences of obedience and disobedience respectively, besides being often referred to elsewhere, are developed, with great rhetorical power, in the fine peroration which forms a worthy ter-

* See the passages quoted on p. xxxiii.

Digitized by Google

mination of the Deuteronomic Code (c. 28; comp. also 11^{26-28} 30^{15-20}).

The practical form which devotion to Jehovah is to take is not, however, to be confined to religious duties, strictly so called. It is to embrace also the Israelite's social and domestic life; and it is to determine his attitude towards the moral and civil ordinances prescribed for his observance. The individual laws contained in c. 12–26 are designed for the moral and social welfare of the nation; and it is the Israelite's duty to obey them accordingly. Love of God involves the love of one's neighbour, and the avoidance of any act which may be detrimental to a neighbour's welfare. The Israelite must therefore accommodate himself to the constitution under which he lives; and, where occasion arises, observe cheerfully the various *civil* ordinances which, in Israel, as in every well-ordered community, are necessary for protection against evil-doers, and for regulating intercourse between members of the same society. The moral purification of the community, effected by the punishment of wrong-doers, and its deterrent effect upon others, are both vividly realized by the Writer: two of his standing phrases in this part of his book are "So shalt thou exterminate the evil from thy midst (*or* from Israel)" ($13^{6(5)}$ $17^{7.12}$ 19^{19} 21^{21} $22^{21.22.24}$ 24^{7}); and "And all Israel (*or* the people, *or* those that remain) shall hear and fear" ($13^{12(11)}$ 17^{13} 19^{20} 21^{21}). Duties involving directly the application of a moral principle are especially insisted on, particularly justice, integrity, equity, philanthropy, and generosity; and the laws embodying such principles are manifestly of paramount importance in the Writer's eyes. Judges are to be appointed in every city, who are to administer justice with the strictest impartiality (16^{18-20}; cf. $1^{16f.}$ $27^{19.25}$). Fathers are not to be condemned judicially for the crimes of their children, nor children for the crimes of their fathers (24^{16}). Just weights and measures are to be used in all commercial transactions (25^{13-16}). Grave moral offences are visited severely: the malicious witness is to be punished according to the *lex talionis* (19^{16-21}); and death is the penalty, not only for murder (19^{11-13}), but also for incorrigible behaviour in a son, unchastity, adultery, man-

Digitized by Google

stealing (21^{18-21} $22^{20f. 22}$ 24^{7}). But *humanity* is the author's ruling motive, wherever considerations of religion or morality do not force him to repress it. Accordingly great emphasis is laid upon the exercise of philanthropy, promptitude, and liberality towards those in difficulty or want, as the indigent in need of a loan (15^{7-11} $23^{20f. (19f.)}$), a slave at the time of his manumission (15^{13-15}), a neighbour who has lost any of his property (22^{1-4}), a poor man obliged to borrow on pledge ($24^{6. 12f.}$), a fugitive slave (24^{7}), a hired servant ($24^{14f.}$), and in the law for the disposition of the triennial tithe ($14^{28f.}$): the landless Levite ($12^{12. 18f.}$ $14^{27. 29}$ $16^{11. 14}$ $26^{11. 12f.}$), and the "stranger —*i.e.* the unprotected foreigner settled in Israel—the fatherless and the widow," are repeatedly commended to the Israelite's charity or regard (14^{29} $16^{11. 14}$ $24^{17. 19. 20. 21}$ $26^{12f.}$ 27^{19}; the stranger alone 10^{19} 26^{11}), especially at the time of the great annual pilgrimages ($12^{12. 18}$ 14^{27} $16^{11. 14}$ 26^{11}), when he and his household partook together before God of the bounty of the soil, and might the more readily respond to an appeal for benevolence. Gratitude, and a sense of sympathy, evoked by the recollection of Israel's own past, are frequently appealed to as the motives by which the Israelite should in such cases be actuated (10^{19} "For ye were strangers in the land of Egypt," cf. $23^{8 (7)}$; 15^{15} 16^{12} $24^{18. 22}$ "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt"). A spirit of forbearance, equity, and regard for the feelings or welfare of others underlies the regulations of 5^{14b} (the slave to enjoy the rest of the sabbath), 20^{5-9} and 24^{5} (cases in which exemption from military service is to be granted), $20^{10f.}$ (offer of peace to be formally made before attacking a hostile city), $20^{19f.}$ (fruit-trees in hostile territory not to be cut down), 21^{10-14} (regard for feelings of a woman taken captive in war), 21^{15-17} (firstborn not to be disinherited in favour of son of favourite wife), 22^{8} (battlement on roof), $23^{25f. (24f.)}$ (regard for neighbour's crops), 24^{19-22} (gleanings to be left for the poor), 25^{3} (moderation in infliction of corporal punishment): humanity towards animals prompts those in $22^{6f.}$ 25^{4}. Several of these provisions are prompted in particular by the endeavour to ameliorate the condition of dependents, and to mitigate the

Digitized by Google

cruelties of war. Not indeed that similar considerations are absent from the older legislation (see *e.g.* Ex. $22^{20-23\,(21-24).\,26f.\,(27f.)}$ $23^{6.\,9.\,11.\,12}$), and (as the Table, p. iv ff., will have shown) some of the enactments that have been cited are even borrowed from it: but they are developed in Dt. with an emphasis and distinctness which give a character to the entire work. The author speaks out of a warm heart himself; and he strives to kindle a warm response in the heart of every one whom he addresses. Nowhere else in the OT. do we breathe such an atmosphere of generous devotion to God, and of large-hearted benevolence towards man; nowhere else are duties and motives set forth with greater depth and tenderness of feeling, or with more winning and persuasive eloquence; and nowhere else is it shown with the same fulness of detail how high and noble principles may be applied so as to elevate and refine the entire life of the community.

If after this review of the general scope of Dt., we ask which are its fundamental ideas, we shall find them to be the following:—*

1. Jehovah is the only God, a pure and spiritual Being, who has loved Israel, and is worthy to receive Israel's undivided love in return. It follows as an immediate corollary from this, that all false gods, and even all material representations of Jehovah, are to be unconditionally discarded.

2. Israel is to be a holy nation: its members are to recollect, in every action and moment ($6^{6f.}$) of their lives, that they are the servants of a holy and loving God; and love is to be the determining principle of their conduct, whether towards God or man.

3. There is to be only one legitimate place of public worship: the local shrines, which were seats of either unspiritual, or of actually heathen worship, are to be not merely reformed, but abolished.

4. The tribe of Levi is confirmed in its possession of priestly rights; and it alone is to supply ministers for the sanctuary.

Deuteronomy, it is evident, is far more than a mere code

* Comp. Duhm, *Theologie der Propheten* (1875), p. 197 ff.

Digitized by Google

of laws. It is the expression of a profound ethical and religious spirit, which determines its character in every part, and invests the laws contained in it with the significance that they possess in the Writer's eyes. They are means which may help Israel to realize its ideal. The author would fain see his people exhibit to the world the spectacle of a nation wisely obeying a just and beneficently designed constitution (4^{6-8}): this, he is assured, will bring with it national prosperity and greatness. But it is not enough for him that the law is obeyed: it must be obeyed also from the right motives. Hence the stress which he lays upon the theocratic premises of Israel's national character, the earnestness with which, in c. 5–11, he develops and applies every motive which may touch Israel's heart or win its allegiance, and the frequency with which, while expounding the laws which Israel is to observe (c. 12–26. 28), he dwells upon the moral purposes which they subserve, or the temper in which they should be obeyed. To fear God is the Israelite's primary duty (6^{13} $10^{12.\,20}$ 28^{58}); and to generate, and keep alive, in Israel's heart the true religious spirit is the aim, not less of the statutes embodied in Dt. (4^{10} $6^{2.\,24}$; cf. 14^{23}), and of many particular usages prescribed in it (*e.g.* $6^{8f.}$ $11^{19f.}$ 31^{12}*), than of the exhortations with which the author accompanies them. In so far, however, as Dt. is a law-book, it may be described as a manual, addressed to the people, and intended for popular use, which, without as a rule entering into technical details, would instruct the Israelite in the ordinary duties of life. It does not embrace a complete *corpus* of either the civil or the ceremonial statutes that were in force when it was written: it excerpts such as were, in the author's judgment, most generally necessary for the Israelite to know, and best adapted to exemplify the moral and spiritual principles which it was his main anxiety to see practically recognized by Israel. Dt. thus combines the spirit of the prophet and the spirit of the legislator: it is a *prophetical law-book*, a law-book in which civil and ceremonial statutes become the expression of a great spiritual and moral ideal,

* Notice also the importance attached to the education of *children*, 4^{9} $6^{7.\,20}$ 11^{19} 31^{13} 32^{46}.

Digitized by Google

which is designed to comprehend and govern the entire life of the community.

The true significance of Dt. cannot, however, be properly understood, until it is viewed in the light of the age which called it forth: in the following remarks therefore it will be necessary in some respects to anticipate the conclusions of § 4, and to assume that Dt. was composed in the 7th cent. B.C., during the reign of either Manasseh or Josiah. If this may be here assumed, it will be seen that the author builds upon the foundation of the prophets, and that his primary aim is to create an effectual moral stimulus for realizing the ideals which they had propounded. The prophets had held up before their people high conceptions of life and duty; they had taught that Jehovah's favour was conditioned by the fulfilment of His moral demands; they had declared, one after another,* that the claims of civil and social justice were paramount in His eyes: Isaiah had reaffirmed, with fresh emphasis, the old truth (Ex. 19^{6}) that it was Israel's vocation to be a "holy nation"; Hosea had traced back both the moral and material deterioration of the Northern Kingdom to its abandonment of Jehovah, and had forewarned it of the bitter consequences which devotion to idolatry would bring in its train. These are the truths which, brought home to the author, with fresh vividness, by the recent experiences of Manasseh's reign, become the informing principles of his teaching; he absorbs them into his own spiritual nature; he shows how they may be systematically applied so as not merely to correct palpable abuses, but also to deepen the spiritual life of individuals, and to penetrate and transform the whole national organization of Israel; while at the same time he so stimulates the individual conscience by new and powerful motives, as to provide an effectual moral and spiritual agency, capable—if any agency were capable—of moulding the nation into conformity with the prophetic ideal.

In a special degree the author of Dt. is the spiritual heir of Hosea. Not only does he join with him in the emphatic repudiation of nature-worship, and in acknowledging Jehovah

* *E.g.* 2 S. 12^{1-6} 1 K. $21^{17ff.}$ Am. 4^{1-3} $5^{12ff.}$ Hos. 4^{1-3} Is. $1^{16f.}$ Mic. 3^{1-4}.

Digitized by Google

as the true Giver of nature's bounty,* he agrees with him also in the prominence which he assigns to the emotional side of religion. With Hosea, love, affection, sympathy are the immediate, and most natural, fruits of the religious temper. Jehovah first "loved" Israel; and the true Israelite is he who is infused with the same spirit, and who loves, with the same spontaneity, and the same ungrudging affection, both Jehovah and his fellow-Israelites. "This truth is equally set forth in Deuteronomy, and in the Deuteronomist's great spiritual predecessor, Hosea. The primal love of Jehovah to Israel fills the foreground of each writer's discourse, and all human relationships within the Israelitish community are rooted in this."† The passages have been already quoted in which Deuteronomy emphasizes Jehovah's love of Israel, and inculcates a responsive love of Jehovah upon Israel's part as the first of human duties. And in his conduct towards his neighbour, the Israelite is to be actuated not only by what strict justice or equity demands; he is repeatedly exhorted to exercise towards him offices of affection and kindness. Love is to be the presiding genius of his life. And thus Dt. teaches the great truth that religion is concerned not merely with the intellect and the will, but that it involves equally the exercise and right direction of the affections. Of course, however, this love, both in Jehovah and in Israel, is a *moral* love; it must be limited, where the necessity arises, by the demands of righteousness: hence idolatry and immorality cannot be tolerated or condoned by it: the author is conscious of no inconsistency in propounding the most rigorous repressive measures against the former; and he finds no occasion for mitigating the severity which ancient usage prescribed for dealing with the latter (p. xxiii, *bottom*).

The monotheistic creed of Dt. is another development of the teaching of the prophets. The original "monolatry" of Israel became indeed, in the hands of the older prophets (cf. p. 90 f.), almost, if not quite, monotheism: nevertheless, this truth is

* Hos. $2^{10\,(8)\,ff.}$ 13^{4-6}; Dt. $8^{7\,ff.}$ $11^{13\,ff.}$ 26^{10}.

† Cheyne, *Jeremiah, his Life and Times*, p. 66. See Hos. 3^{1} 9^{15} $11^{1.4}$ $14^{5\,(4)}$; 4^{1} $6^{4.6}$ $12^{7\,(6)}$ (*ḥesed* demanded by God: see p. 102).

Digitized by Google

taught more formally and explicitly in Dt. ($4^{35.\,39}$ 6^{4} 7^{9} 10^{17}) * than by earlier writers; and its vivid realization by the author finds expression in the insistence with which he urges Jehovah's claim to be the *exclusive* object of the Israelite's reverence. The limitation of the public worship of Jehovah to Jerusalem, which Dt. inculcates so strongly (c. 12, &c.), may seem indeed to *us* to be a retrograde step, and inconsistent with the author's lofty conception of the Divine nature (10^{14}): but partly it was a result of the national feeling of Israel, to which the prophets, even in their most exalted moments,† were hardly ever wholly superior, and which looked up to the national Temple on Zion as specially honoured by Jehovah's presence; partly it arose out of the circumstances of the age, which made the local sanctuaries centres of impure or unspiritual rites. *Under the conditions of the time*, the single sanctuary was a corollary of the monotheistic idea. Worship at different places would tend (as in the case of Baʽal, and many other ancient deities) to generate different conceptions of the god worshipped, and might even lead to the syncretistic confusion of Jehovah with other deities. The concentration of worship in a single spot was thus a necessary providential stage in the purification of the popular idea of God. In the end, it is true, this exclusiveness, maintained with blind one-sidedness and exaggeration, brought with it its own nemesis. The unspiritual Israelites, in spite of the warnings of the prophets (comp. Jer. 7^{1-15} Is. 66^{1-4}), viewed the material sanctuary on Ẓion as the palladium of their security, operating irrespectively of their own moral worthiness; and in a later age attachment to the Temple, as such, was one of the causes which incapacitated the Jews from appropriating the more spiritual teaching of Christ.‡ But long before then, the victory over polytheism had been won; and even the destruction of the Temple brought with it no danger of a lapse into the idolatries of the past.

The *ethical* qualities of Jehovah are frequently dwelt upon in Dt. He is emphatically a *righteous* God; a hater of sin

* Note also 4^{19} (where the heathen religions are attributed to the supreme providence of Israel's God); and (in the Song) 32^{39}.

† *E.g.* Is. 2^{2-4} 25^{6} Jer. 3^{17} Is. 56^{7} $66^{20.\,23}$.

‡ Comp. Acts 6^{13-14}.

and wrong; ignoble practices are an "abomination" to Him; * yet He is ready to forgive the penitent, and shows mercy and compassion towards those who deserve it: He has watched over, and cherished Israel, with the tenderness and affection of a father; if He has also disciplined it, it has been for its ultimate good. Especially does the author emphasize Jehovah's fidelity to His promises; the oath sworn to the patriarchs He will never break; even towards a heathen nation He does not rescind what He has once decreed (2^{5}).

Jehovah's relation to Israel originated in His own free *choice*; Israel becomes in consequence His special possession (p. xx) and inheritance, and the constant object of His regard. More particularly, His relation to it is represented under the figure of a covenant—one of the characteristic ideas both of Dt. and of the Deuteronomic school (p. 68)—involving mutual duties and obligations, binding Jehovah to faithfulness, and Israel to obedience. The nature of the duties devolving hence upon Israel, and the motives (especially *gratitude* and *love*) which should prompt Israel to respond accordingly, have been indicated above (pp. xxi, xxiv).

With priestly institutions the author has greater sympathy than the prophets generally. He evinces a warm regard for the priestly tribe; he guards its privileges (18^{1-8}), demands obedience for its decisions (24^{8}; cf. 17^{10-12}), and earnestly commends its members to the Israelite's benevolence ($12^{18. 19}$ $14^{27. 29}$ &c.). The ceremonial observances current at the time he has no desire to see abolished; the custom of sacrifice, though he does not emphasize it in the manner of the Priests' Code, he takes for granted, and upon occasion regulates. A right heart, instinct with true affections towards God and man, is indeed the only religion which has value in his eyes: but he is aware that external forms, if properly observed, may exercise and keep alive a religious spirit (14^{23}), may guard Israel's "holiness" from profanation, and preserve it from contamination with heathen influences (cf. 6^{8} 11^{18} 14^{1-21}; also $22^{5. 12}$ $23^{15 (14)}$). The offerings on which he lays the greatest

* Idolatrous rites ($7^{25. 26}$ 12^{31} $13^{15 (14)}$ 17^{4} 20^{18} 27^{15}); magic and divination (18^{12}); immoral customs (22^{5} $23^{19 (18)}$ 24^{4}); commercial injustice (25^{16}).

Digitized by Google

stress are those expressive of gratitude to God as the Giver of the good things of Canaan (14^{22-27} 15^{19-23} $16^{10.15.17}$ 26^{10}): and the religious feasts, especially those held in connexion with the great annual pilgrimages, he desires to be occasions of gladness before Jehovah, and of the display of generous hospitality towards the destitute ($12^{7.12.18}$ $14^{26f.}$ $16^{11.14}$ 26^{11}).

In its attitude towards other nations, Dt. shows considerable exclusiveness and "particularism." Jehovah owns indeed the entire world; but His favourable regard is limited to the people of His choice. The prophetic truth that Jehovah has also a care for other nations, and will one day receive them into His fold, does not find expression in Dt. (once, perhaps, indirectly, in the Song, 32^{43}). The reason is not far to seek: Dt. is a law-book, designed to provide *Israel* with instruction in the duties of life; and the circumstances of the age naturally led the author to discourage, rather than to promote, a friendly attitude towards the heathen. The *Gêr*, who has placed himself under the protection of Israel (p. 126), is indeed treated naturally with consideration: but the "foreigner," as such, stands upon a different level, and is excluded from pecuniary advantages permitted to the Israelite (15^{3} $23^{21\,(20)}$). Religious motives* sufficiently explain the strongly hostile attitude adopted towards the Canaanites; but only an antiquarian reason is assigned for the antipathy displayed towards the ʿAmmonites and Moabites ($23^{4-7\,(3-6)}$), and for the injunction to exterminate ʿAmaleḳ (25^{17-19}). A more friendly attitude, based upon the recollections of the past, is inculcated towards the Edomite and the Egyptian ($23^{8f.\,(7f.)}$). It is probable that all these regulations, as Ex. 17^{14-16} shows to be the case with that relating to ʿAmaleḳ, rest upon an ancient traditional basis,† and that the author's part in them is limited to the form in which they are cast, and the motives with which he has enforced them.

The encroachments of heathenism formed the pressing danger of the age; and these the author strove to resist by every means in his power. Not only does he repeatedly

* See $7^{3f.}$ 20^{18} (cf. in D^2 Jos. $23^{12f.}$).
† Comp. Delitzsch, *ZKWL.* 1880, p. 561; Dillm. p. 605.

Digitized by Google

declare, in solemn terms, that if allowed to prevail, they will ultimately involve Israel in national ruin; but a large number of provisions—much larger than in the Book of the Covenant—are aimed directly against them; and the need of enforcing these overrides even those considerations of forbearance and humanity, which usually rule supreme in the author's mind.* Foremost among these provisions stand the injunctions for the extirpation of the Canaanites. These are included in Dt., partly, no doubt, because they formed an element in the older legislation (Ex. 23^{31-33}), and were ascribed traditionally to Moses, but chiefly because by the drastic completeness with which they sought to secure Israel against pernicious religious influences, they were a significant protest against the fashions of the age, and afforded the author a means of expressing indirectly his profound abhorrence of practices which he knew to be subversive of holiness (cf. 12^{31}). In estimating these injunctions, it must, of course, be remembered that in the age when Dt. was written, the time when they could be enforced had long passed away; they had consequently only an *ideal* value; they bear witness by their severity to the intensity of the author's convictions on the subject, and to the reality of the dangers which he felt threatened Israel's religion from this quarter.† It is probable also that many more prohibitive ordinances of Dt. than appears on the surface, are directed against the encroachments of heathenism, or the assimilation of undesirable foreign customs. "The essential object of the short law of the kingdom (17^{14-20}) is to guard against admixture with foreigners, and participation in foreign policy." ‡ And other precepts are directed either against popular heathen superstitions, or against the immoralities of Phœnician nature-worship, which, as the Books of Kings and the prophets show, had deeply tainted the worship of Jehovah.§

The truth that virtue is rewarded with temporal blessings, and vice punished with temporal misfortunes,—a truth

* See especially c. 13.

† Cf. Cheyne, *Jeremiah*, p. 67; Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 185.

‡ *OTJC.*[2] p. 365.

§ Comp. the notes on $12^{2.31}$ $14^{1.20}$ (p. 164), ^{21b} $16^{21.22}$ $17^{1.3}$ 18^{9-11} 22^{5} $23^{18f.}$.

tenaciously held by the ancient Hebrews, and (as the book of Job shows) even treated by them as a *universal* law of God's providence,—is an important pædagogic principle, and, as such, is frequently emphasized by the author. The doctrine that "righteousness exalteth a nation," while wickedness is the sure prelude to national disaster, has been said truly to form the essence of his "philosophy of history," as it is also one of the motives to obedience on which he most frequently insists: "that thou mayest live," "that it may be well for thee," "that thou mayest prolong thy days," "that Jehovah may bless thee," or similar phrases, are the recurring formulæ, which show how assured he was of the general validity of the truth which they express.* The same conviction finds hyperbolical expression in the promise that, in the event of obedience, Israel will be "set high" above all nations (26^{19} 28^{1}), and enjoy material superiority over them (15^{6b} $28^{12b. 13}$). The other aspect of the same doctrine is taught less frequently, but not less forcibly.† Retribution, it is said emphatically (7^{10}), overtakes the evil-doer in person; it is not reserved (as was sometimes thought ‡) for his descendants.

The religious value of Deuteronomy is very great. True, "it is a book of national religion," with the limitations incident to age and place stamped upon it; "but it is withal a book of personal religion, and so of universal religion." The power which gave Israel its cohesion and strength was its religion; if it was untrue to this, as its prophets unanimously saw, it must fall in pieces. Religion becomes thus the real ground of all moral and social order; and the aim of Dt. is to establish for religion a deeper basis than that of public ritual,

* The promise is annexed both to the general observance of the Deut. law, 4^{40} $5^{26\,(29).\,30\,(33)}$ $6^{2.\,3.\,18.\,24}$ 10^{13} 11^{9} $30^{16.\,19f.}$ 32^{47} (cf. also $7^{12\text{-}16}$ $11^{13\text{-}15.\,20\text{-}25.\,27}$ $26^{18f.}$ $28^{1\text{-}14}$ $29^{8\,(9)}$ 30^{6}), and to particular commands, viz. 5^{16} (honour to parents), $12^{25.\,28}$ (prohibition to eat blood), 14^{29b} (application of triennial tithe to relief of the poor), $15^{10.\,18}$ (liberality in lending to needy, and in treatment of slave), 16^{20} (impartiality in judgment), 17^{20} (king's obedience to Deut. law), 19^{13} (justice on murderer), 22^{7} (humane treatment of bird), $23^{21\,(20)}$ (not demanding interest of Israelite), 24^{19} (leaving forgotten sheaf for the "stranger, the fatherless, and the widow"), 25^{15} (commercial honesty). Comp. Am. 5^{14} Is. $1^{19f.}$ $3^{10f.}$ $58^{6\text{-}11}$ &c.

† 4^{26} $30^{17f.}$; $6^{14f.}$ $8^{19f.}$ $11^{16f.\,28}$ $28^{15ff.}$ $29^{17\,(18)ff.}$ 31^{29}.

‡ Job 21^{19}.

Digitized by Google

or legal rules. The author addresses himself, more directly and effectively than any previous teacher of Israel had done, to the individual soul; he labours, by appealing to the most powerful and generous emotions, to quicken and intensify the religious life of the individual. "Hosea had already perceived that in our religious life, it is not so much we who find God, as God who finds us. Deuteronomy accepted this truth, and sought to show what forms the religious life thus quickened would assume among Yahveh's people. It discerned that that life must be a life of loyal obedience and of holy affection; and inasmuch as these are not outward acts but inward states, it took the first steps towards transferring the stress of religion from national observance to individual consciousness, and proposed as its ultimate ideal a community which should collectively realize a relationship of reverence and love to its heavenly Lord. These great sentiments could only be comprehended and expressed by the community, when they had first been deeply felt by each single soul; and in enunciating its principles for the government of the traditional Israel, Deuteronomy was therefore, in fact, enunciating them for the whole human race in every age. It was reserved for the greatest of Israel's sons to discern this completely, and to proclaim its highest word as the first law, no longer for Judah but for the world (Mark $12^{28\text{-}30}$; Dt. $6^{4\text{-}5}$). And so the teaching of Deuteronomy leads direct to the supreme thought of Christ." *

§ 4. *Authorship, Date, and Structure.*

The relation of Dt. to the preceding books of the Pent., as indicated in § 2, gives rise to two questions, the consideration of which will conveniently open this part of our subject. It will be proper, in order to make our ground secure, to start with the assumption that the traditional view of the authorship of the first four books of the Pent. is correct. The questions,

* J. E. Carpenter, "The Book of Deuteronomy," in the *Modern Review*, April 1883, p. 281.—In parts of the preceding pages I am indebted to Holzinger, *Einleitung in den Hexateuch* (1893), p. 313 ff.

Digitized by Google

then, which suggest themselves are: (1) Do the variations between the narratives of Dt. and Gn.–Nu. ever assume the character of discrepancies which cannot be reconciled? (2) Is the relation between them such as to be incompatible with the traditional view that the author of both is Moses? That the author of Dt., supposing him to be identical with the author of Ex.–Nu., should mention, either in the retrospects (c. 1–3; 9^{7}–10^{11}) or allusively elsewhere, incidents not recorded by him in his previous narrative, would, of course, not in itself excite surprise; accordingly additions such as those in $1^{6-8.\ 16f.\ 20f.\ 29-31}$ $3^{21f.\ 23-28}$ cause no difficulty, they relate to details of a personal character, a notice of which would be conformable to the plan of the retrospect, but which might well have been passed over in the history. There are, however, some other variations, which deserve closer consideration.

1. In 1^{9-13} the plan of appointing judges to assist Moses is represented as originating with Moses himself, complaining to the people of the difficulty that he found in dealing personally with the number of cases that arose; the people assent to the proposal, and Moses selects the judges accordingly. In Ex. 18^{13-26} the plan is referred entirely to the advice of Jethro; no allusion is made to the difficulty felt by Moses; and Moses takes action without at all consulting the people. It might be replied that the two accounts are mutually supplementary: what is narrated in Dt. 1^{9-13} would fall very naturally between Ex. 18^{24} and Ex. 18^{25}: the narrative and the retrospect are written from different points of view; and some notice of the motives by which Moses was inwardly influenced, and of the manner in which the people responded to them, though unnecessary in the narrative, would be in harmony with the general plan of the retrospect.

2. 1^{22-23}. Here the mission of the spies is represented as due entirely to a suggestion made by the people: in Nu. 13^{1-3} it is referred to a command received directly by Moses from Jehovah. No doubt the two representations are capable, in the abstract, of being harmonized: Moses, it might be supposed, approving personally of the proposal (Dt. 1^{23a}), desired to know if it had Jehovah's sanction; and the command in Nu. 13^{1-3} is really the answer to his inquiry. But in this case, if not in the former as well, it remains remarkable, if the two accounts were written by one and the same person, that they should be so worded as to suggest to the reader *two different ideas of what had taken place*; and (especially) that Moses, while mentioning (Dt. 1^{23}) that the proposal had his own approval, should not mention that it had Jehovah's also.

3. 1^{37-38}. In Nu. 20^{12} (cf. $27^{13f.}$ Dt. $32^{50f.}$) Moses is prohibited to enter Canaan on account of his presumption in striking the rock at Ḳadesh, in the 39th year of the Exodus: here the ground of the prohibition is Jehovah's anger with him *on account of the people* (so 3^{26} 4^{21}), upon an occasion which

Digitized by Google

(see the note *ad loc.*) is plainly fixed by the context for the 2nd year of the Exodus, 37 years previously. The supposition that Moses, *speaking in the 40th year*, should have passed, in v.^{37}, from the 2nd to the 39th year, returning in v.^{39} to the 2nd year, is highly improbable.

4. 1^{46} $2^{1.14}$. As shown in the notes on pp. 31–33, it seems impossible to harmonize the representation contained in these passages with that of Numbers; according to Nu. 14, &c., the 38 years in the wilderness were spent at Ḳadesh: according to Dt. they were spent *away* from Ḳadesh (2^{14}), in wandering about Edom (2^{1}).

5. 9^{9}. According to Ex. 32–34 Moses was three times in the mount ($32^{1ff.}$; 32^{31}; 34^{4}); but it is only on the third occasion that he is recorded to have fasted (34^{28}): Dt., in the very words of Ex., describes him as doing so on the *first* occasion. Obviously, Dt. may relate what is passed by in silence in Ex.; but the variation is remarkable.

6. 9^{25-29}. This, it is plain, must refer either to Ex. $32^{31f.}$ (Moses' *second* visit to the mountain), or (more probably) to Ex. $34^{9.28}$ (his *third* visit to it). It is singular, now, that the terms of *Moses' own intercession*, as here reproduced, are borrowed, not from either of these passages, but from 32^{11-13}, at the close of his *first* forty days upon the mountain.

7. 10^{1-4}. This passage (see p. 117 f.) agrees—to a large extent verbally—with Ex. $34^{1-4.28}$, with the difference that in Dt. Moses is directed to make, and actually does make, an ark of acacia-wood *before* ascending the mount the third time, to receive the Ten Commandments. That Moses should describe as made by himself what was in fact made by Beẓal'el, acting on his behalf, is, no doubt, natural enough; but in the narrative of Ex. (as it now stands) the command is both given to Beẓal'el, and executed by him, *after* Moses' return from the mountain ($36^{2f.}$ 37^{1}). The discrepancy in two narratives, *so circumstantial as each of these is*, is difficult to explain, if both are the work of one and the same writer, describing incidents in which he was personally concerned.

8. 10^{6-7}. Cf. Nu. 33^{31-33} (in P's itinerary of the journeyings in the wilderness), relating, however, to a period long subsequent to the episode of the Golden Calf. In Nu., moreover, the stations Beeroth and Bene-ja'aḳan are mentioned in the inverse order; and (v.^{38}) the death of Aaron is stated to have taken place, not at Mosĕrah, but at Mount Hor, four stations beyond Joṭbathah. As shown in the notes on p. 119 f., there is a possible formal reconciliation, though not one that can be called probable. All things considered, it seems, however, likely (p. 120) that 10^{6-7} is not part of the original text of Dt.; if this be the case, Dt. will be relieved of the contradiction with Nu. 33^{31-33}, though the contradiction will still attach to the source from which the notice is derived, and bear witness to the existence of divergent traditions in our present Pentateuch.

9. 10^{8-9}. If 10^{6-7} be an integral part of Dt., as *at that time* can in that case refer only to the period indicated in those verses, 10^{8-9} will assign the consecration of the tribe of Levi to a much later date than is done in Ex. 28–29 Lev. 8 Nu. 3^{5-10}. If, however, 10^{6-7} be not original in Dt., *at that time* will refer to the period of the sojourn at Ḥoreb, 10^{1-5}; in this case, there ceases to be a contradiction with Ex., but the reference seems to be (see p. 121) to some incident not mentioned in the existing text of Ex.

Digitized by Google

Of these discrepancies, 1 and 2, though they cannot be said to be favourable to Moses' authorship, are nevertheless not absolutely incompatible with it; 5 and 6 awaken graver doubts—it is surprising that the retrospects should afford so many cases (see p. xviii), from the intercession of Moses to the slaughter of the sons of Siḥon (or 'Og), in which the reconciliation can only be effected by a *duplication* of the event recorded in the earlier narrative; 3, 4, and 7 cannot be fairly explained upon the hypothesis of Mosaic authorship.

We may pass now to the consideration of the *laws* in Dt., in their relation to those of Ex.–Nu. Let us first compare the laws in Ex. 21–23 (JE). Here we observe in certain cases modifications which cannot be reasonably accounted for, except upon the supposition that the laws of Dt. originated in a later stage of society than the laws of Ex. Even the greater detail and development (p. viii f.) points in this direction, though not, of course, so decisively as the cases of modification.

1. In Ex. $21^{2\text{-}11}$ a Hebrew bondman is to serve for six years, and to receive his freedom in the seventh year (v.[2]); a bondwoman who comes into servitude with her husband is to receive her freedom at the same time (v.[3]). But a daughter sold by her father as a bondwoman is on a different footing; she is not to go free as the bondmen do (v.[7]). In Dt. 15^{12} the law of Ex., by the addition of "or an Hebrewess," is pointedly extended so as to include bondwomen; and in v.[17] it is expressly prescribed that the bondwoman (without any limitation) is to be subject to the same law of manumission as bondmen. Both laws are designed for the land of Canaan, as appears from the reference to the door and doorpost. If both laws, however, were given in the wilderness for a time of future settlement in Canaan, the variation just noted appears arbitrary. It is, however, at once explicable upon the supposition that the law of Dt. springs from a more advanced stage of society than the law of Ex., and regulates usage for an age in which the father's power over his daughter was less absolute than it had been in more primitive times, and when it was no longer the custom (see Ex. $21^{8\text{-}9}$) for a Hebrew girl to be *bought* to be the wife of her master or his son. Contrast also Dt. 15^{17} and Ex. 21^{6} (p. 184).

2. In Ex. 21^{13} the asylum for manslaughter (as the connexion with v.[14] appears to show) is Jehovah's *altar* (cf. 1 K. 1^{50} 2^{28}); in Dt. (c. 19) definite cities are set apart for the purpose.

3. In Ex. $22^{15f.\,(16f.)}$ the law of seduction stands at the close of a list of cases of pecuniary compensations for injury to property: the offence is consequently treated as one of pecuniary loss to the father, who must be

Digitized by Google

compensated by the seducer purchasing the damsel as wife for the full price (*mōhar*) of a virgin. In Dt. the corresponding law ($22^{28f.}$) appears not among laws of property, but among laws of moral purity; and though it is still provided that the offender shall marry the damsel and make compensation to the father, a fixed fine takes the place of the variable *mōhar*.*

4. In Ex. $23^{10f.}$ the provisions of the sabbatical year have a purely agricultural reference; in Dt. 15^{1-6} the institution is applied so as to form a check on the power of the creditor. Had both laws been framed by Moses, it is difficult not to think that in formulating Dt. 15^{1-6} he would have made some allusion to the law of Ex. $23^{10f.}$, and mentioned that, *in addition to* the provisions there laid down, the sabbatical year was to receive also this new application.

Modifications such as these cannot reasonably be attributed to the altered circumstances or prospects of the nation at the close of the 40 years' wanderings: the provisions of Ex., as is plain both from the tenor of $23^{20ff.}$, and from the various laws implying the existence of houses, and the possession of separate holdings of land, are equally designed for the use of the people when settled in Canaan. Those of Dt. differ just in being adapted to meet the needs of a more developed state of society, for which the provisions of Ex. were no longer adequate.

If, however, it is thus difficult to attribute the laws of Dt. and JE (Ex. 21–23) to the same legislator, it is altogether impossible to do this in the case of the laws of P; for not only are the variations which the regulations of Dt. present much graver, but, as shown above (p. xiii f.), it cannot be supposed that P was one of the sources employed by the author of Dt.: laws and institutions of fundamental importance in P are treated in Dt. as if they were either non-existent, or matters of no concern to the Writer; they are sometimes contradicted, sometimes ignored. Instances of their being ignored were cited above, p. xiii; the following are instances of contradiction:—

1. In Lev. Nu. a sharp distinction is drawn—and enforced under stringent penalties (Nu. $16^{10.35.40}$)—between the priests and the common Levites: in Dt. it is implied (18^{1a}) that *all* members of the tribe of Levi are qualified to exercise priestly functions; and regulations are laid down

* Comp. W. R. Smith, *Addit. Answer to the Libel* (Edin. 1878), p. 56 f.; *OTJC.*[2] p. 368 f.

Digitized by Google

(18^{6-8}) to meet the case of any member coming from the country to the central sanctuary, and claiming to officiate there as priest.

2. In P particular provision is made for the maintenance of both priests and Levites, and in Nu. 35^{1-8} (cf. Jos. 21) 48 cities are appointed for their residence. In Dt., under both heads, the regulations are very different, and allow considerably less ample provision for the maintenance of the tribe. Thus Dt. 18^{3} (the shoulder, the cheeks, and the maw to be the priest's perquisite in a peace-offering) is in direct contradiction with Lev. 7^{32-34} (the breast and the right thigh to be the priest's due in a peace-offering).

3. Dt. 18^{6} is inconsistent with the institution of Levitical cities (Nu. 35^{1-8}); it implies that the Levite has no settled residence, but is a "sojourner" in one of the cities ("gates," see p. lxxix) of Israel. As remarked on p. 218, the provision of Dt. 18^{6} is not incompatible with such an institution, supposing it to have been imperfectly put in force; but its terms are quite general, they are not limited to any such future contingency as this, and (what is especially noticeable) they harmonize with other passages of Dt. in which the country Levite is represented as destitute of adequate maintenance, and is placed in the same category with the "stranger, the fatherless, and the widow" ($12^{12.18.19}$ $14^{27.29}$ $16^{11.14}$ $26^{11.12f.}$).

4. In Dt. $12^{6.17f.}$ $15^{19f.}$ the firstlings of oxen and sheep are to be *eaten by the owner himself* at a sacred feast to be held at the central sanctuary: in Nu. 18^{18} they are assigned absolutely and expressly to the *priest.*

5. In Nu. 18^{21-24} the tithe is assigned entirely to the Levites, who in their turn (v.$^{26-28}$) pay a tenth to the priests: in Dt. it is, in two years out of three, to be consumed by the offerer and his household at a sacred feast (14^{23}), and in the third year to be applied to the relief of the poor ($14^{28f.}$),—in both cases the members of the priestly tribe sharing only together with other destitute persons in the offerer's bounty.

6. While Lev. 25^{39-43} enjoins the release of the Hebrew slave in the year of jubile, in Dt. 15^{12-18} the legislator, *without bringing his new law into relation* with the different one of Lev., prescribes the release of the Hebrew slave in the seventh year of his service.

7. In Lev. 17^{15} the flesh of an animal dying of itself (*nebēlāh*) is not to be eaten either by the Israelite or by the "stranger": in Dt. 14^{21} it is prohibited for the Israelite, but permitted to the "stranger."

8. In Ex. 12^{3-6} the paschal sacrifice is limited to a lamb: in Dt. 16^{2} it may be either a sheep or an ox (see also the note on 16^{7}).*

These differences between the laws of Dt. and those of P are greater than could arise, were the legislator the same in

* For attempts that have been made to harmonize these discrepancies, see the notes on the passages quoted. The explanations offered by Principal Douglas—whose name I mention with all respect—in *Lex Mosaica* (pp. 80–96) must be regretfully pronounced to be not less strained and unsuccessful than those of his predecessors.

Digitized by Google

both: they can only be explained by the supposition that the two systems of law reflect the usage of two distinct periods of the national life. Of course there is no difficulty in supposing that Moses may have foreseen the neglect of his own institutions and provided for it accordingly: but not one of the regulations that have been referred to betrays any indication whatever that this was the intention of the legislator in framing it; in every case the terms of the provision are as unqualified and absolute as are those of P. It is also undoubtedly true that the aim of Dt. is very different from that of P: the one is intended (chiefly) for the guidance of the priests, the other is addressed to the people; the one represents the priestly point of view, the other that of the prophets; the one lays down a complete code of ritual observances, which certainly does not fall within the scope of the other. Still, if P were written by Moses,—or even compiled by another hand under his direction,—it is inconceivable that in recapitulating at the close of his life the laws which he desired the Israelites to observe, he should have thus held himself aloof from a body of law, in the compilation of which he had (*ex hyp.*) been so intimately concerned, ignoring institutions which he had represented as of central significance in his system,* and contradicting regulations which he had declared to be invested with the highest sanctions.† Not only does Dt. not contain (in any sense of the word) a *résumé* or "recapitulation" of the laws of P, but the author does not even do what, supposing him to have been interested in a great ceremonial system, would have been consonant with the general plan of his work, and at the same time of the utmost value to future generations of Israelites: he does not, even in general terms, refer to the system which (*ex hyp.*) he had prescribed, for the purpose of summarizing its leading principles, or of defining the place which ceremonial institutions should hold in a spiritual

* See p. xiii. The Day of Atonement, it is enjoined in P (Lev. $23^{28f.}$), is to be observed by all under penalty of death.

† The rights and revenues of the tribe of Levi do fall within the scope of Dt. (see 18^{1-8}), not less than within that of P, and yet the provisions are altogether different.

Digitized by Google

religion.* On the contrary, his attitude towards it shows that its most characteristic ideas are alien to his mind, and have no place in his scheme of religion.

The study of the legal sections of Dt. leads thus to the same conclusion which resulted from the study of the historical sections: each, when compared with the corresponding sections of Ex.–Nu., presents inconsistencies incompatible with the supposition of both being the work of the same author. This conclusion follows, even if (as has up to this point been assumed) Moses be the author of the preceding books of the Pentateuch. It is confirmed by the independent evidence of *style*. The literary styles of Dt. and P, while each has a strongly individual character, are cast in two entirely different moulds; if Moses was the author of the one, he cannot have so far disowned his own individuality as to be also the author of the other. Nor can the Mosaic authorship of Dt. be maintained in face of a comparison with JE. That a *composite* narrative of the Exodus should have arisen in the lifetime of Moses, and that Moses himself should have drawn upon it in Dt., cannot be considered probable. But waiving this point, and treating JE as the work of a single hand, the style, though not *so* different from the style of Dt. as P's style is, nevertheless differs from it more than would be consonant with the tenacious literary habits of Hebrew authors, were the writer in both cases the same: the discourses of Dt. are pervaded throughout by a uniform colouring and tone, which are absent from JE (comp. p. lxxvii), and are an indication that we have before us the work of another hand.†

In point of fact, however,—though the proof cannot be stated here, and must be sought in the Commentaries on the books in question,—the Mosaic authorship of the first four books of the Pent. cannot be sustained. JE and P were composed at two widely different periods of Israelitish history,

* He does this, to some extent, for the laws of JE (16^{1-17}), but not for those of P.—Comp., also, Westphal, pp. 172 ff., 231 ff., 241 ff.

† Similarly Dean (now Bishop) Perowne (*Contemp. Rev.* Jan. 1888, p. 144): "The book is in style quite unlike the other books of the Hexateuch: it stands absolutely alone. If it is the work of Moses, the other books cannot claim his authorship." On P's style, cf. *L.O.T.* pp. 122–128.

Digitized by Google

and both, there are the strongest reasons for supposing, long subsequent to Moses. Of course, for those who admit this, the post-Mosaic authorship of Dt. follows at once; for, as was shown above (pp. viii f., xv f.), it is dependent upon, and consequently later than, JE.

This conclusion, to which different lines of argument independently converge, is supported by other indications. There are passages, for instance, in Dt., showing that the author lived at a distance from the period which he describes. Thus, if 1^{3} ("eleventh month") be compared with Nu. 33^{38} ("fifth month"), which fixes the date of Nu. 20^{22-28}, it appears that the whole of the events reviewed in 2^{2}–3^{29} had taken place during the six months preceding the time when, if Moses be the author, the discourse must have been delivered. In such a situation, however, the repeated *at that time* (2^{34} $3^{4.8.12.18.21.23}$), as also *unto this day* in 3^{14}, though suitable when a longer interval had elapsed, appears inappropriate. C. 5^{3} and 11^{2-7} point in the same direction. The writer, though aware as a fact ($8^{2.4}$) of the 40 years' wanderings, does not appear fully to realize the length of the interval, and identifies those whom he addresses with the generation that came out of Egypt in a manner which betrays that he is not speaking as a contemporary. In 2^{12b} ("as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which Jehovah gave him") there is an evident anachronism: however, some writers have treated the antiquarian notices $2^{10-12.20-23}$ (though otherwise in the style of Dt. and similar to $3^{9.11.13b}$ 11^{30}) as glosses. The expression, "when ye came forth out of Egypt," not merely in 24^{9} 25^{17}, but also in $23^{5(4)}$, of an incident quite at the *end* of the 40 years' wanderings (cf. $4^{45b.46b}$), could not have been used naturally by Moses, speaking less than six months afterwards, but testifies to the writer of a later age, in which the 40 years had dwindled to a point.

That Dt. is of later origin than the age of Moses may be inferred, further, from two other considerations. (1) The use of the phrase "beyond Jordan" (בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן) for the country *East* of Jordan, in Dt. $1^{1.5}$ 3^{8} $4^{41.46.47.49}$ (as elsewhere in the Pent.: comp. Nu. 22^{1} 34^{15}), exactly as in Jos. 2^{10} 7^{7} 9^{10} &c. Jud. 5^{17}

Digitized by Google

10^{8}, shows that the author was a resident in *Western* Palestine. It is indeed sometimes alleged that the expression had a fixed geographical sense (like *Gallia Transalpina*, &c.), and was used as a standing designation of the trans-Jordanic territory, irrespectively of the actual position of the speaker or writer; but Dt. $3^{20.25}$ 11^{30} and Jos. 5^{1} 9^{1} 12^{7} (where it is used of Western Palestine), show that this assumption is incorrect. If, now, its meaning was *not* thus fixed, its employment by a writer, whether in E. or W. Palestine, of the side *on which he himself stood*, is difficult to understand, unless the habit had arisen of viewing the regions on the two sides of Jordan as *contrasted with each other*; * and this of itself implies residence in Palestine. It is, of course, conceivable that this was a habit of the Canaanites; but it can hardly be considered likely that the usage suggested by it passed from them to the Israelites, before the latter had set foot in the land, and experienced the conditions adapted to naturalize it among them. The use of the expression in Dt. (as in the Pent. generally) exactly as in Jos. 2^{10} &c. creates a very strong presumption that the passages in question were all written under similar local conditions.†

(2) The law respecting the place of sacrifice, as formulated in Dt., must have arisen at a much later age than that of Moses. As shown in the notes on c. 12 (pp. 136–138), while Dt. insists with great emphasis that all sacrifices are to be offered only at a single sanctuary, the spot chosen by Jehovah "out of all the tribes to set His name there," the law of Ex. 20^{24} permits altars to be built, and sacrifice to be offered upon them, in any part of the land without distinction; and with

* Hence its use in Jos. 5^{1} 9^{1} 12^{7}, written (presumably) in W. Palestine.

† So Dean (now Bishop) Perowne, *Contemp. Rev.* Jan. 1888, p. 143 f. In Dt. $3^{20.25}$ the (assumed) position of the speaker is naturally maintained. In v.[8], on the contrary, *in a phrase of common occurrence* (4^{47} Jos. 2^{10} 9^{10}), as in Jos. $1^{14.15}$, the point of view of the *writer* unconsciously betrays itself. Nu. 32^{19} מעבר לירדן והלאה . . . מעבר הירדן מזרחה, where the expression is used of *both* sides of Jordan, though it has been referred to, has no bearing on the present question: the usage here falls into the category of passages in which, in accordance with Heb. idiom, the same expression repeated acquires a contrasted meaning in virtue of the juxtaposition (cf. 1 S. 14^{4} $20^{21.22}$ 23^{26}). From the use of the term in Nu. 32^{19} nothing can consequently be inferred as to its force, when used *absolutely*, as in Dt. $1^{1.5}$ &c.

Digitized by Google

the principle thus laid down the practice of the age from Joshua to Solomon (and even later) conforms: during this period mention is frequently made of altars being built, or sacrifice offered, at places other than that at which the Ark was stationed, without any indication (and this is the important point), on the part of either the actors or the narrator, that an irregularity is being committed (see esp. 1 S. 9^{12-14} $10^{3.5}$; 1 K. 18^{30}). It is, of course, true that the non-observance of a law does not of necessity imply its non-existence; nevertheless, when men who might fairly be presumed to know of it, if it existed, not only make no attempt to put it in force, but disregard it without explanation or excuse, such an inference cannot be deemed an extravagant one.*

The composition of Dt. must thus be placed at a period long subsequent to the age of Moses. Is it possible to determine its date more precisely? The *terminus ad quem* is not difficult to fix; it must have been written previously to the 18th year of King Josiah (B.C. 621), the year in which Ḥilḳiah made his memorable discovery of the "book of the law" in the Temple

* A. van Hoonacker (*Le lieu du culte dans la Législation rituelle des Hébreux*, 1894) interprets Ex. 20^{24} of *private* altars, and seeks to show that the laws of Ex. 21–23 recognise only one legitimate public sanctuary, so that the law of Dt. 12 is not the innovation that it is commonly supposed to be. It is true, no doubt, that critics have sometimes unduly minimized the importance of the sanctuary at which the Ark was stationed —whether at Shiloh or elsewhere, or afterwards at Jerusalem—before the Deuteronomic legislation: *de facto*, the sanctuary which, in a special sense, was Jehovah's dwelling-place must always have had the pre-eminence (cf. Ex. 23^{19}); and the Temple of Solomon, by its splendour, and the associations of veneration and regard with which time naturally invested it, must have tended more and more to throw into the shade the minor local sanctuaries; still, in face of the evidence of the historical books, it is difficult to think that sacrifice at other spots was regarded as actually illegitimate. The truth seems rather to be that centralizing tendencies had manifested themselves long before the age of either Manasseh or Josiah; in Dt. they are brought to a head, the preference, or pre-eminence, which the Temple had long enjoyed *de facto* is confirmed to it *de jure*, and that in such a manner as to secure for it at the same time *exclusive* rights, as against all other sanctuaries. The law of Dt. remains an innovation; but it is an innovation for which the soil had long been preparing.

Digitized by Google

(2 K. $22^{8ff.}$). For the narrative of 2 K. 22–23 makes it plain that the book so found must have embraced Deuteronomy; * for although the bare description of its contents, and of the effect produced by it upon those who heard it ($22^{11.\ 13.\ 19}$) might suit Lev. 26 equally with Dt. 28, yet the allusions to the *covenant* contained in it ($23^{2.\ 3.\ 21}$), which refer evidently to Dt. (28^{69} (29^{1}): cf. $29^{8.\ 20.\ 24\ (9.\ 21.\ 25)}$), and the fact that in the reformation based upon it, Josiah carries out, step by step, the fundamental principles of Dt.,† leave no doubt upon the matter.

How much earlier than B.C. 621 Dt. may be, is more difficult to determine. The following considerations, how-

* Or, at least, c. 5–26. 28 (p. lxv). It cannot be shown to have included more than Dt. (see Schrader, *Einl.* § 206 *b*, *c*; Dillm. p. 613; *OTJC.*[2] p. 258; Westphal, p. 289 ff.; &c.); but that is immaterial to the present argument.

† Viz. the abolition of all heathen rites and superstitions, and the centralization of Jehovah's worship at Jerusalem: comp. 2 K. $23^{4.\ 5b.\ 11}$ (worship of the host of heaven put down) with Dt. 17^{3}; $23^{5.\ 13}$ (priests and sanctuaries of various "other gods") with Dt. 6^{14} 11^{28} 17^{3} &c.; $23^{8.\ 13.\ 14.\ 15.\ 19}$ (the high-places, with their altars, "pillars," and Ashérim) with Dt. $12^{2f.}$; 23^{6} (the Ashérah in the Temple) with Dt. 16^{21}; 23^{7} (the *Ḳedēshim*) with Dt. $23^{18\ (17)}$; 23^{9b} (provision made for the support of the disestablished priests out of the Temple dues) with Dt. 18^{8a}; 23^{10} (Molech-worship) with Dt. 18^{10a}; $23^{21.\ 23}$ (the passover in *Jerusalem*) with Dt. $16^{5f.}$; 23^{24} (consulters of ghosts and familiar spirits) with Dt. 18^{11}; v.[25] (Josiah's piety) with Dt. 6^{5}. If the reader will peruse consecutively (cf. Cheyne, *Jeremiah, his Life and Times*, p. 50 f.) Dt. $6^{4-5.\ 14-15}$ 12^{2-7} 16^{21-22} 18^{9-15} 28, he will have an idea of the passages which may have principally impressed Josiah. The covenant which the king and nation solemnly enter into, to observe the newly discovered code, is also described in terms which point unmistakably to Dt. (2 K. 23^{3} "to keep his commandments, and his testimonies, and his statutes, with all the heart and with all the soul": see p. lxxxi f., Nos. 37, 51). The title *book of the law* (2 K. $23^{8.\ 11}$) recalls Dt. 28^{61} $29^{20\ (21)}$ 30^{10} 31^{26} Jos. 1^{8} 8^{34} (all of the Deut. code). Whether any weight is to be attached to the reminiscence in 22^{19} of Dt. 28^{37} is less certain; for though in *substance* Ḥuldah's prophecy is no doubt authentic, it is pretty clear that it owes its *form* to the Deuteronomic compiler of Kings, so that the reminiscence may be due to him rather than to Ḥuldah herself. The expression "confirm the words," &c. (2 K. $22^{3.\ 24}$), recalls Dt. 27^{26}; but it is doubtful whether this verse is part of the original Dt. (p. 300). The law of Dt. 18^{6-8} was not, however, fully carried out: the disestablished priests of the high-places, though they were received by their "brethren" at Jerusalem, and allowed a share in the Temple dues, were not permitted to minister at the altar (2 K. 23^{9}),—whether Josiah was not able to enforce this provision on account of the opposition of Ḥilḳiah and the other Ẓadoḳite priests, or whether they were felt to be disqualified for such sacred duties by the part they had taken in idolatrous rites.

Digitized by Google

ever, tend to fix its date more closely, and to show that it belongs, most probably, either to the reign of Manasseh, or to the early years of the reign of Josiah.

1. The differences between the laws of Dt. and those of Ex. 21–23 tend to show that the two Codes are separated from each other by a considerable interval of time, in the course of which the social and political organization of the community had materially developed, and the Code of Ex. had ceased to be adequate to the nation's needs.*

2. The law of the kingdom (17^{14-20}) is coloured by reminiscences of the monarchy of Solomon. The argument does not deny that Moses may have made provision for the establishment of a monarchy in Israel, but affirms that the form in which the provision is here cast bears the stamp of a later age.

3. The terms of Dt. 17^{8-13} (cf. 19^{17}), in which the constitution of the supreme tribunal is not *prescribed*, but represented as *already known* (cf. p. 207), appear to presuppose the existence of the judicature, instituted (according to 2 Ch. 19^{8-11}) by Jehoshaphat.

4. The forms of idolatry alluded to, especially the worship of the "Host of heaven" (4^{19} 17^{3}), point to a date not earlier than the 2nd half of the 8th cent. B.C. It is true, the worship of the sun and moon is ancient, as is attested even by the names of places in Canaan: but in the notices (which are frequent) of idolatrous practices in the historical books from Judges to Kings, no mention of the "Host of heaven" occurs until the reign of Aḥaz; and in the 7th cent. it is alluded to frequently.† The temptation to worship "other gods" is the pressing danger of the age, both in Dt. and in Jeremiah.

5. The influence of Dt. upon subsequent writers is clear

* Cf. Cheyne, *Jeremiah*, p. 71: "The Israel of Dt. is separated from the Israel of the Exodus by a complete social revolution. The nomad tribes have grown into a settled and wealthy community (notice the phrase 'the elders of the city,' 19^{12} &c.), whose organisation needs no longer to be constituted, but only to be reformed." Why the new features in the legislation of Dt. cannot be accounted for by the altered circumstances of the nation at the close of the 40 years' wanderings, is shown on p. xxxviii.

† 2 K. 23^{12} (Aḥaz); 2 K. $21^{3.5}$, cf. $23^{4.5.11.12}$ (Manasseh); 2 K. 17^{16} (Deut.) the reference is vague: Ẓeph. 1^{5} Jer. 8^{2} 19^{13}; 7^{18} 44^{17}; Ez. 8^{16} refer to a later period. It was introduced, in all probability, from Babylonia.

Digitized by Google

and indisputable. It is remarkable, now, that the early prophets, Amos, Hosea, and the undisputed portions of Isaiah, show no certain traces of this influence; Jeremiah exhibits marks of it on nearly every page; Ezeḳiel and Deutero-Isaiah are also evidently influenced by it. If Dt. were composed between Isaiah and Jeremiah, these facts would be exactly accounted for.

6. The language and style of Dt., clear and flowing, free from archaisms (see § 5), but purer than that of Jeremiah, would suit the same period. Dillm. (p. 611) remarks justly that the style of Dt., especially in its rhetorical fulness and breadth of diction, implies a long development of the art of public oratory, and is not of a character to belong to the first age of Hebrew literature.

7. The *prophetic teaching* of Dt., the dominant theological ideas, the points of view under which the laws are presented, the principles by which conduct is estimated, presuppose a relatively advanced stage of theological reflexion, as they also approximate to what is found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

8. In Dt. 16^{22} we read, "Thou shalt not set thee up a *maẓẓēbah* (obelisk), which Jehovah thy God hateth." Would Isaiah, it is asked, if he had known of such a law, have adopted the *maẓẓēbah* (19^{19}) as a symbol of the future conversion of Egypt to the true faith? * Or, if he had known of

* Cf. *OTJC.*[2] p. 355; Ryle, *Canon of the OT.* p. 56: and comp. below, p. 204. The supposition that obelisks connected with *heathen* places of worship are meant in Dt. 16^{22} is not favoured by the context (v.^{21b}); the use of these has, moreover, been proscribed before, 7^5 12^3 (repeated from Ex. 23^{24} 34^{13}). The older legislation enjoins the destruction of *heathen* altars and obelisks; but contains no prohibition corresponding to Dt. 16^{22}: in Ex. 24^4 obelisks are erected beside an altar by Moses. The argument is sometimes met by the answer that the obelisk spoken of by Isaiah was a commemorative one, intended merely to indicate to the traveller entering Egypt, that it was a country sacred to Jehovah. But it could not have served this purpose, without possessing *some* religious associations; and these, according to Dt. 16^{22}, were of a character which Jehovah "hated." At the same time, the argument does not possess the cogency of those of a broader and more general character: for a *single*, isolated law, in the face of opposing custom, might drop out of notice; and the prophet's figure would in that case have been merely suggested to him by prevalent popular usage.

Digitized by Google

Dt. 14^1, would he have said (22^{12}) that *Jehovah* "called" to a practice which is there prohibited?

9. The law of Dt. 18^{20-22} presupposes an age in which the true prophets found themselves in conflict with numerous and influential false prophets, and it became necessary to supply Israel with the means of distinguishing them, *i.e.* the period from the 8th cent. onwards (Dillm. pp. 331, 612).

10. In general, as Oettli (p. 16) remarks, both the religious and the national experiences presupposed by Dt. are much wider than those of the Mosaic age can have been.

So soon as Dt. is recognized as a work of the 7th cent. B.C., the phenomena which were so perplexing, upon the hypothesis of its Mosaic authorship, are at once readily explicable. For history, it was dependent (in the main) upon JE: that was the popular narrative of the *origines* of Israel: the narrative of P (if indeed it already existed) had not yet been combined with JE, and was little known. The author, however, not being the author of JE as well, follows it freely, sometimes perhaps interweaving reminiscences from memory; hence he now and then inadvertently places a clause in a new setting (p. xviii), or is guilty of a slight inconsistency. The incidents mentioned by him without the authority of JE (p. xvii f.) may have been derived by him in some cases from an independent source, oral or written: for others, notably those narrated in the earlier books at points of juncture between the narratives of JE and P, his source was far more probably JE itself, in parts which the last compiler of the Hexateuch sacrificed when he combined JE with P, but which, at the time when Dt. was written, were still read by the author in their integrity. In the legal parts of his work, the modifications and additions which the legislation of Dt. presents, when compared with that of JE, are simply a consequence of the more varied needs of the society for which it was designed. The sparseness of references to priestly institutions, and the discrepancies with P (p. xxxix), are explained at once, when it is remembered that many of these institutions had not yet reached the form in which they are systematized in the Priests' Code, and that the author, while free from any desire to depreciate ceremonial

Digitized by Google

observances (p. xxx), was nevertheless a man whose interests were chiefly centred in the prophetical aspects of religion.

The question whether Dt. is to be assigned to the reign of Manasseh or Josiah is a more difficult one. Let us consider the historical conditions of the 7th cent. B.C., and the motives, or influences, under which Dt. may have been composed.

Throughout his long prophetic career, Isaiah had proclaimed the advent, so soon as Syrian or Assyrian troubles were over, and Judah was able again to breathe freely, of an ideal state of purity and blessedness; Judah was then to realize its ideal character of a "holy nation"; her citizens, from the king downwards, were to exhibit ideal excellences; a great moral and spiritual regeneration was to be effected, and the national character was to be radically transformed.* Publicly and privately, this was the teaching which Isaiah reiterated: and upon all spiritually minded Israelites, we may be sure, his powerful personality, and noble ideas, made a profound impression. At the time, one of the chief obstacles to purity of religion appears to have been the local shrines, or "high-places" (p. 139): here the worship of Jehovah could be despiritualized, and even contaminated with heathen rites, more readily than was possible—except under a distinctly idolatrous king—at the Temple of Jerusalem. Isaiah, however, though he speaks of images with reprobation and disparagement,† does not (in his extant prophecies) wage war against the local sanctuaries as such,‡ and hardly even alludes to the worship of "other gods." § It is the moral shortcomings of his contemporaries which stir him most deeply, and fill a more prominent place in his writings than the denunciation of heathen rites. As yet, notwithstanding the patronage of Aḥaz (2 K. 16^{3}, cf. 23^{12}), distinctively heathen influences were not apparently so aggressive in Judah as they were destined to become shortly afterwards. Ḥezeḳiah, however, appears to have seen that any serious religious reform must begin at

* Is. $1^{26f.}$ 4^{2-6} 29^{18-24} 30^{20-22} 31^{7} $32^{1-8.\,15-17}$ 33^{5-6}. See the writer's *Isaiah, his Life and Times*, pp. 22, 26, 58, 62, 110 f.

† $2^{8.\,18.\,20}$ 17^{8} 30^{22} 31^{7}. ‡ Cf. however, 1^{29}.

§ Cf. 17^{10b}. This term, so common in Dt., Jer., and other Deuteronomic writers (p. lxxviii), is not found in Isaiah.

the local sanctuaries; and hence (though the description may attribute to him more than he actually accomplished *) he removed, it is said, the high-places, and commanded all men to worship before the altar in Jerusalem (2 K. $18^{4.22}$ 21^{3}). This, we may conclude, was the practical form in which Isaiah's teaching took shape in Ḥezeḳiah's mind, and in which he sought to give effect to Isaiah's ideals.

But whatever Ḥezeḳiah effected by this measure, was very soon undone. Under his successor, Manasseh, who occupied the throne for nearly 50 years, a violent and determined reaction in favour of heathenism set in. Not only were the high-places re-established; but distinctively heathen cults were so patronized by the king that they threatened to supersede altogether the service of Jehovah. The worship of Baʿal, of the Ashérah, and of the "host of heaven," was carried on in the courts of the Temple itself; the odious rites of Molech (p. 222 f.) were revived; various other superstitious or immoral practices also became fashionable.† Nor would Manasseh brook opposition: the loyal servants of Jehovah, who resisted his innovations, were relentlessly persecuted and slain; the "innocent blood," which he shed in Jerusalem, is a standing charge against his memory.‡ The prophecy Mic. 6^{1}–7^{6} is an interesting and instructive monument of this reign: for, on the one hand, it presents a vivid picture of the moral corruption of the age (6^{10-12} 7^{1-6}), and of the infatuated eagerness with which the people pressed forward to propitiate the deity even with the sacrifice of their dearest (6^{7}); and, on the other hand, it supplies evidence that the voice of the prophets was not silenced, but that they could still proclaim, in accents of calm resignation and trust, that what Jehovah demanded of His worshippers was not material offerings, however costly, but "to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God" (6^{8}).

With the accession of Josiah (B.C. 639), there came no doubt a change. The readiness with which Josiah yielded himself to the principles of Deuteronomy, and the terms in

* Cf. *OTJC.*[2] pp. 355, 357; Montefiore, *Hibb. Lect.* p. 164.
† 2 K. 21^{2-7}; cf. $23^{4-7.11-12}$. ‡ 2 K. 21^{16} 24^{4}; cf. Jer. 2^{30}.

Digitized by Google

which Jeremiah alludes to him (Jer. 22^{15b-16}), combine to show that his character was that of a religiously-minded, amiable prince, who would be the last to follow in the footsteps of Manasseh, or willingly be disloyal to Israel's creed. The prophetical party, and their adherents, could now therefore lift up their heads in peace; and active persecution ceased. But a child of eight could not be expected to inaugurate at once a new policy: nor, as a matter of fact, for some 18 years was any material alteration effected; the syncretistic and idolatrous worship continued; even the Temple was not purged of its heathen disfigurements. These and other reforms were only carried out in consequence of the effect wrought upon Josiah by Deuteronomy, after its discovery in the Temple, in his 18th year (2 K. 22–23).

Our information respecting the 55 years of Manasseh's reign, and the first 17 of Josiah's, is fragmentary: it is only by conjecture that we can either picture to ourselves the condition to which the prophetical party was reduced by the persecuting measures of Manasseh, or imagine the steps which they may have taken for the purpose of arresting, if possible, the downward movement of the nation. But the 7th century, it is evident, marked a crisis in the religious history of Judah: the longer Manasseh's reign continued, the more critical must the times have seemed to the true worshippers of Jehovah: nor, even after Josiah's accession, could the crisis have been considered to be past, so long as the heathen practices sanctioned by his grandfather maintained their hold upon the nation. Deuteronomy represents the first serious attempt made to counteract the tendencies of the age. It may have been in the dark days of Manasseh, when the spiritual energy of prophecy, no longer able, as of yore, to make its voice heard openly among the people, nevertheless refused to be suppressed, and, hopeful of better times, provided in anticipation a spiritual rallying-point, round which the disorganized forces of the national religion might under happier auspices one day range themselves again. Or it may have been later, when the character of the young King Josiah afforded promise of speedier success, that the needful stimulus

Digitized by Google

was found, and that the prophets, encouraged by the brighter prospect, resolved upon putting forward the spiritual requirements of the age, in a shape which, if circumstances favoured, might serve more immediately as a basis of reform.

Such, at any rate, whichever the age to which it belongs, was the aim which the prophetic author of Dt. set himself. The means which he adopted for giving it practical effect were well chosen. His object was to quicken the national conscience, and at the same time to bring it into touch with the principles which regulated the national life. Accordingly he comes forward neither solely as a prophet, nor solely as a legalist. The prophet, as such, though he asserted with noble eloquence the claims of a spiritual religion and a pure morality, was apt to be too abstract and ideal in his teaching to influence the masses of his countrymen; and the mere promulgation of a collection of laws would obviously be valueless as a stimulus to moral action. The author adopted accordingly a method for which, on a smaller scale, there was already a precedent in the "Book of the Covenant"; he selected such laws as he deemed most important for his people to observe, he presented them in a popular dress, and he so combined them with homiletic introductions and comments as to make them the vehicle of a powerful appeal in the interests of spiritual religion. If the religious life of the nation was to be successfully reformed, there was need, he saw, of a reaffirmation in emphatic terms of the old national creed, and of the practical consequences which followed logically from it; the principles which Moses had long ago proclaimed, as the foundation of national well-being, must be reasserted; the exclusive claims of Jehovah upon the Israelite's loyalty, and the repudiation of every practice and observance inconsistent with them, must be again insisted on; an effort must be made to reinfuse the national life, in the more complex form which it had now assumed, with the spirit of Moses; the old laws must (where necessary) be so adjusted to the needs of the times, as to constitute an efficient safeguard against the dangers which threatened the religion of Israel. This was the aim of Deuteronomy, viewed in the light of the

Digitized by Google

age which gave it birth. It was a great manifesto against the dominant tendencies of the time. It was an endeavour to realize in practice the ideals of the prophets, especially of Hosea and Isaiah, to transform the Judah demoralized by Manasseh into the "holy nation" pictured in Isaiah's vision, and to awaken in it that devotion to God, and love for man, which Hosea had declared to be the first of human duties (p. xxvii f.). The author exhausts all his eloquence in setting forth, as impressively as possible, the truths which he desires Israel to lay to heart: in noble and melodious periods he dilates upon the goodness of Jehovah, and the claims which He has in consequence upon Israel's allegiance; warm-hearted and generous himself, he strives, in works aglow with fervour and affection, to evoke corresponding emotions in Israel's breast; while now and again, adopting a graver mood, he points ominously to the dark background of warning, such as the fate of the Northern kingdom brought only too conspicuously before him. "Thus were the old laws presented in a popular form, as the 'people's book,' combining creed and law, exhortation and denunciation. It was a prophet's formulation of 'the law of Moses,' adapted to the requirements of that later time. 'The law,' in the guise of prophecy, this might become a spiritual rallying-point for Judah and Jerusalem; it might be the means of upholding spiritual life even in the overthrow of national hopes." *

If Dt. were written under Manasseh,† it is easy to understand how, after having been deposited for safety in the Temple, or taken there by some priest, it might, in the neglect and disorder into which during that reign the arrangements of the Temple were suffered to fall, have been mislaid and lost; and the surprise occasioned by its discovery, during some repairs, by the high priest Ḥilḳiah, is thus readily accounted for. By others, on the contrary, the calm and hopeful spirit which the author displays, and the absence even of any covert allusion

* Ryle, *Canon of the OT.* p. 60.

† So Ewald, *Hist.* i. 127, iv. 221; Bleek, *Introd.* § 126; W. R. Smith, *Add. Answer*, p. 78; Kittel, *Gesch. der Hebr.* i. 57–59; Ryle, *Canon*, pp. 54 f., 56, 60; Wildeboer, *Letterkunde des Ouden Verbonds* (1893), p. 220.

Digitized by Google

to the special troubles of Manasseh's time, are considered to be objections to that date: the book, it is argued, is better understood as the direct outcome of the reforming tendencies which the early years of Josiah must have called forth, and as designed from the first with the view of promoting the ends which its author labours to attain.* Those who assign Dt. to this date sometimes suppose, moreover, that the party of reform not only designed Dt. with this practical aim in view, but also devised the means by which it should be brought under the notice of the king, whose friendly co-operation was essential to the success of their plans. Ḥilḳiah undertook the responsibility of doing this. He seems, it is said by those who adopt this view, to have so acted as to give the appearance of accident to a long preconcerted design. Shaphan, the "scribe," or chancellor, having been sent to the Temple with a message from Josiah, relating to some repairs that were being executed there, Ḥilḳiah declared that he had "found" it in the Temple; he handed it to Shaphan, who in his turn laid it before the king. The sequel is well known. The king, when he heard it read, was amazed to find how its fundamental principles had been disregarded; he hastened to secure the co-operation of the people of the land, and at once took active steps to give them practical effect (2 K. 22–23).

The grounds for referring the composition of Dt. to the reign of Josiah in preference to that of Manasseh are not decisive: from the nature of the case, an exhortation placed in Moses' mouth could not be expected to contain allusions to the *special* circumstances either of Manasseh's or of Josiah's reign; and the narrative of the discovery certainly supports the view that the book which was found was one which had

* So Reuss, *La Bible, Traduction nouvelle, &c.* (1879) i. 156 ff.; *Gesch. der Heil. Schr. AT.s*, §§ 286-288; Kuenen, *Hex.* p. 214; Dillm. (less confidently) p. 613 f.; Cheyne, *Jeremiah*, p. 75 ff.; *Founders of OT. Crit.* p. 267 ff.; Stade, *Gesch.* i. 650 ff.; Cornill, *Einl.* § 9. 3; Holzinger, *Einl.* p. 327 f.; Montefiore, *Hibb. Lect.* p. 177 ff.; &c. Delitzsch (*ZKWL.* 1880, p. 509) treats Dt. as anterior to Isaiah: Westphal (p. 269 ff.) and Oettli (p. 19 f.) both argue that it must have given the impulse to Ḥezeḳiah's reform (2 K. $18^{4.22}$). König, *Einl.* p. 217, places it "shortly after 722."

Digitized by Google

been lost for some time, not one which had just been written. Nor, even if Dt. were composed under Josiah, is there sufficient reason for supposing that Ḥilḳiah acted as the agent of the reformers in the manner suggested. The book, even though intended to promote a reform, might well have been written while Josiah was yet a child, and placed at once in the Temple —perhaps by the side of other legal documents—in hopes that the time might come when some practical use could be made of it: Ḥilḳiah need have known nothing about it; his discovery of it would then have been (as it purports to be) purely accidental.*

To this conclusion, that Dt. was written in the age of either Manasseh or Josiah, it is objected that the book plainly produced its effect on account of the authority which it was believed to possess, in other words, on account of its claiming, and being supposed, to be the work of Moses: if Josiah had not believed the ancient law-book of Israel to have been discovered, would he have attached any weight to its words? An attempt is indeed made, it is said, to parry this objection by the allegation that the authority which lay behind Dt. was the power of the prophetic teaching, and that the effect which it produced was due to its throwing into a more practical form the ends aimed at by Ḥezeḳiah and Isaiah; but if this be the case, it is replied, seeing that the prophets themselves were the accredited ministers of Jehovah, why was not the appeal made directly to the Divine teaching upon their lips? Why should the mere fact of this teaching being presented in the form of a Code give it a force which no prophetic utterances had ever possessed? Its force must have been due principally to the name of Moses, which it bore; and if the prophets were aware that it did not really possess his authority, then not only

* That Ḥilḳiah had a hand in the composition of Dt. is not probable: for Dt. (as has been often remarked) does not emphasize the interests of the Jerusalem priesthood (cf. *OTJC.*[2] p. 363; Dillm. p. 614), but tends (18^{6-8}) to place the country Levites, coming to officiate at the central sanctuary, upon the same footing as the priests already resident there. It was Ḥilḳiah's merit that he perceived at once the importance of Dt., and co-operated readily with Josiah in carrying out the reformation upon the lines which it laid down.

Digitized by Google

are they guilty of an act questionable morally, but the course taken by them is a confession of moral impotence and failure: they resort to an external name to accomplish what centuries of their own teaching had failed to effect.*

In estimating these objections, it must be remembered, firstly, that what is essentially new in Dt. is not the *matter*, but the *form*. Dt., says Dillmann truly,† "is anything but an original law-book." The laws which agree with those of the Book of the Covenant can be demonstrated to be old: those which agree with H have (p. xi) the presumption of being based upon some common older source; the priestly usages alluded to are evidently not innovations: the laws peculiar to Dt. have, with very few exceptions, the appearance either of being taken directly, with unessential modifications of form, from older law-books,‡ or else of being accepted applications of long established principles,§ or the formulation of ancient customs,|| expressed in Deuteronomic phraseology. And such laws as are really new in Dt., are but the logical and consistent development of Mosaic principles.¶ Even the law for the centralization of worship, it is probable (p. xliv), is only relatively an innovation: it accentuated, with limitations demanded by the dangers of the age, the ancient pre-eminence of "Jehovah's house" (Ex. 23^{19}), focalizing, at the same time, tendencies which had long been operative, and which the prophets themselves had adopted and approved. All Hebrew legislation, both civil and ceremonial, however, was (as a fact) derived ultimately from Moses, though a comparison of the

* Dean (now Bishop) Perowne, *Contemp. Rev.* Feb. 1888, p. 255 ff.

† Pref. to *Ex. Lev.* p. viii.

‡ Especially many of those in 21^{10}–25^{19} (cf. p. 244).

§ As $17^{8\text{-}13}$ $19^{16\text{-}21}$ (Dillm. p. 604).

|| As $21^{1\text{-}9}$ $22^{13\text{-}21}$ $25^{5\text{-}10}$ (Dillm.): cf. Oettli, p. 16; also Reuss, *La Bible, &c.* i. 160: "La seule innovation véritable, que nous sachions, c'était la défense absolue du culte hors de Jérusalem." It is this fact which explains the ready acceptance of Dt. by the king and nation: it was not sprung upon the people as a code of laws unheard of before; it was felt, as soon as it was discovered, to be (in the main) merely the reaffirmation of laws and usages which had been long familiar to the nation, though in particular cases they might have fallen into neglect.

¶ Oettli, p. 17.

Digitized by Google

different Codes in the Pentateuch shows that the laws cannot all in their present form be Mosaic: the Mosaic nucleus was expanded and developed in various directions, as national life became more complex, and religious ideas matured. Nevertheless, all Hebrew laws are formulated under Moses' name,—a fact which shows that there was a *continuous Mosaic tradition*, embracing a moral, a ceremonial, and a civil element: the new laws, or extensions of old laws, which as time went on were seen to be desirable, were accommodated to this tradition, and incorporated into it, being afterwards enforced by the priestly or civil authority as the case might be.* Those who concede the existence of such a practice, on the part of Hebrew legislators, will find it remove difficulties which the critical view of Dt. may otherwise present. If it was the habit thus to identify the stream with the source, and to connect old laws, extended or modified, or even new laws, with the name of the original lawgiver, then the attribution of the laws in Dt. to Moses ceases to be a proceeding out of harmony with the ideas and practice of the Hebrew nation. It is no fraudulent invocation of the legislator's name: it is simply another application of an established custom.

Nor, in judging of the *form* of Dt., should it be forgotten that ancient writers permitted themselves much freedom in ascribing to historical characters speeches which they could not have actually delivered in the shape in which they are now assigned to them. The similarity, in many cases, of the speeches to the narrative in the OT. is an indication that

* Comp. Ryle, *Canon of the OT.* p. 31: "The fact, now so clearly established, that the laws of Israel, as of other nations, only reached their final literary form by development through gradual stages, must show conclusively that Moses was not the writer of them in the form in which they have come down to us, and in which they were certainly known after the exile. But just as, in Dt. $31^{9.24}$, Moses himself is said to have committed to writing the law, which formed the nucleus of the Deuteronomic legislation, so we understand the legislation which was initiated by Moses to have become expanded into the complex system of laws included in the Pentateuch" (cf. also p. 22 ff.). The laws of JE, Dt., H, and P, are codifications of the legislative material thus expanded from a Mosaic nucleus, which differ from one another partly in the *age* at which they were made, partly in the *purposes* for which they were designed.

Digitized by Google

the Biblical writers followed the same practice: the books of Joshua, Kings, and Chronicles, for instance, afford particularly clear examples of speeches either entirely composed, or enlarged, by the respective compilers,—in the Chronicles, David, Solomon, and various early prophets even express ideas and use idioms which are distinctively *late*, and are mostly peculiar to the compiler of the Chronicles himself.* In cases where the narrators are nearly contemporary with the events which they describe they may have had information as to what was actually said, which they may merely have re-cast in their own words; but very often this was certainly not the case, and the speeches simply give imaginative expression to thoughts or feelings appropriate to the character and occasion to which they are referred. Deuteronomy, upon the critical view of its authorship, is merely an example, upon an extended scale, of the same practice, which has many and admirable precedents in the literature of the world. The imaginative revivification of the past, by means of discourses, conversations, and even of actions, attributed dramatically to characters who have figured upon the stage of history, has been abundantly exemplified in literature: the educational influence, and moral value, of such creations of human art have been universally allowed: the dialogues of Plato, the epic of Dante, the tragedies of Shakespeare, the *Paradise Lost*, and even the poem of Job, to name but a few of the great imaginative creations of genius, have never been condemned as immoral frauds, because the characters introduced in them did not always—or ever—use the actual words attributed to them. But the author, in each case, having a message to deliver, or a lesson to teach, placed it in the mouth of the person to whose character it was appropriate, or whose personality would give it force, and so presented it to the world. *Mutatis mutandis*, the procedure of the Deuteronomist was similar. No elaborate literary machinery was needed by him: a single character would suffice. He places Moses on the stage, and exhibits him pleading his case with the degenerate Israel of Josiah's day. In doing this, he assumes no unjustifiable

* See, for illustrations, the *Expositor*, April, 1895, p. 241 ff.

Digitized by Google

liberty, and makes no unfair use of Moses' name: he does not invest him with a fictitious character; he does not claim his authority for ends which he would have disavowed; he merely develops, with great moral energy and rhetorical power, and in a form adapted to the age in which he lived himself, principles which (as will appear immediately) Moses had beyond all question advocated, and arguments which he would have cordially accepted as his own.

Secondly, as regards the motives which induced Josiah to carry out his reformation: if Josiah would not have instituted his reforms, unless he had believed Dt. to be written by Moses, was he led to act as he did act, under false pretences? Here it must be observed that the point of capital importance in Dt. is *the attitude of the nation to Jehovah*: loyalty to Him is the basis of the promises, disloyalty to Him brings in its train the terrible consequences in which Josiah, when he heard them, deemed his people to be already involved. Now, if there is one thing which (even upon the most strictly critical premises) is certain about Moses, it is that he laid the greatest stress upon Jehovah's being Israel's only God, who tolerated no other god beside Him, and who claimed to be the sole object of the Israelite's allegiance.* But these are just the fundamental principles of Deuteronomy. They are expanded and emphasized in it with great eloquence and power: but in substance they are Mosaic; all that belongs to the post-Mosaic author, is the rhetorical form in which they are presented. In yielding therefore to the effect which the denunciations of Dt. produced upon him, Josiah was not being won to the cause of truth by false pretences: he was obeying principles and motives which, in the strictest sense of the words, were those of Moses. Josiah's reformation was essentially a *religious* one: its aim was to purify the worship of Jehovah from heathen elements, which, in principle, Moses had altogether condemned, though he had not (probably) reprobated in words the precise forms which they assumed in the age of Josiah. The law of the single sanctuary is not an end in itself, it is but a *means*, propounded ($12^{2ff.}$) for the purpose of

* Cornill, *Der Israelitische Prophetismus* (1894), p. 25 f.

Digitized by Google

securing the same end. The denunciations in Dt. are no attached to the neglect either of this or of any other *particula* enactment: they are attached to the neglect of the Deuteronomi law generally, and especially to the neglect of its primar principle, loyalty to Jehovah (4^{25-28} 6^{13-15} $8^{19f.}$ $11^{16f. 28}$ 28^{15f} $30^{17f.}$). The fundamental teaching of Dt., especially tha which exerted the greatest influence over Josiah, thus di possess Mosaic authority; nor was the legislator's nam invoked in support of principles which he had not sanctioned and would not have approved.

Undoubtedly prophetic sanction underlay Deuteronomy. The prophetic teaching of the preceding centuries was the dominant influence under which it was written: its own prophetic authority it bears upon its face; and, as if that might not be sufficient, its claims are approved by the prophetess Huldah. If, then, it be asked why, if the prophets were thus influential, they were not content to appeal directly to the Divine word upon their lips, instead of having recourse to Moses' name, the answer must be that it was because they were desirous of effecting a systematic reform in the observance and administration of the *law*. The prophets, as such, were preachers, not practical reformers: they strove by their words to win the people to the broad principles of morality and civil justice; but when it became necessary to bring these principles into relation with the statutes of the civil and ceremonial law, and to show how they should supply motives for their observance, then the legal form was the natural one to be adopted, and the prophetic teaching was cast into the form of a legislative discourse of Moses. Already in the legislation of JE, moral and religious motives are suggested for the observance of the laws, though not, of course, so copiously as in Dt. But the considerations advanced above show that Moses' name was not resorted to in any improper or unfair way: it was invoked in accordance with a custom sanctioned by precedent, and in defence of principles which were no recent innovation, but had been promulgated by Moses himself.

It will now be apparent how little foundation there is for the objection, which is not unfrequently heard, that if the

Digitized by Google

critical view of Dt. be correct, the book is a "forgery," the author of which sought to shelter himself under a great name, and to secure by a fiction recognition or authority for a number of laws "invented" by himself. The idea that the laws are the author's "inventions" is entirely out of the question: not only would the fact, if true, have been immediately discovered, and have proved fatal to their acceptance by the nation; but (p. lvi) it is inconsistent with the evidence supplied by Dt. itself. Certainly, in particular cases, the author may have taken upon himself to give a new application to an old established principle: but upon the whole the laws of Dt. are unquestionably derived from *pre-existent usage.* Even what has been deemed the utopian character of some of the laws cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence that they are the author's own creation: in c. 20, for instance, though the form is Deuteronomic, the *substance* is certainly earlier: the law of military service implies a simpler state of society than the age of the later kings; the author of Dt. has merely cast into his own phraseology some old usages which had perhaps been allowed to fall into neglect, and which, being in harmony with his philanthropic nature, he desired to see revived. The new element in Dt. is thus not the laws, but their *parenetic setting.* The author did not seek, by the fraudulent use of a great name, either to gain reputation for himself, or to obtain recognition for enactments of his own creation: his aim was to win obedience to laws, or truths, which were already known, but were in danger of being forgotten. His own position, as towards the Code, is thus essentially subordinate: he is not an originator, but expounds anew old principles. Deuteronomy may be described as the *prophetic reformulation, and adaptation to new needs, of an older legislation.* It is probable that there was a tradition, if not a written record, of a final legislative address delivered by Moses in the Steppes of Moab: the plan followed by the author would rest upon a more obvious motive, if he thus worked upon a traditional basis.* But be that as it may, the bulk of the laws contained in Dt. is undoubtedly far more

* So Delitzsch, *ZKWL.* 1880, p. 505; Westphal, pp. 278–281; Oettli, p. 17.

Digitized by Google

ancient than the time of the author himself; and in dealing with them as he has done, in combining them into a manual adapted for popular use, and bringing them into close relation with moral and religious principle, he cannot, in the light of the considerations that have been adduced, be held guilty of dishonesty or literary fraud. There is nothing in Dt. implying an interested or dishonest motive on the part of the (post-Mosaic) author: and this being so, its moral and spiritual greatness remains unimpaired; its inspired authority is in no respect less than that of any other part of the Old Testament Scriptures which happens to be anonymous.

It may be worth while here to notice briefly some other objections to the critical date of Dt.

1. Dt. contains, it is said, provisions that would be nugatory and unintelligible in the 7th cent. B.C.; for instance, the injunction to give no quarter to the inhabitants of Canaan (7^{1-5} 20^{16-18}). Of course, as the *creation* of that age, such an injunction would be absurd: but it is *repeated* from Ex. 23^{31b-33}; in a recapitulation of Mosaic principles, addressed *ex hypothesi* to the people when they were about to enter Canaan, it would be naturally included; and so far from being nugatory in the age of Manasseh or Josiah, it would (as remarked above, p. xxxii) have indirectly a great value as a protest, in the name of the Founder, against the idolatrous tendencies of the age. The injunction against 'Amaleḳ (20^{17-19}) is also not original in Dt.: it is repeated from Ex. 17^{16}, and would be suitable in Moses' mouth at the time when the discourses of Dt. are represented as having been delivered. The law of the kingdom (17^{14-20}) is also, in all probability, the Deuteronomic expansion of an older nucleus: as a reaffirmation of the fundamental theocratic principles, which the monarchy in Israel should maintain (cf. p. 210), it is in no degree inappropriate to the 7th cent. B.C., and contains nothing that would have sounded "absurd" to an Israelite reading it then for the first time.

2. Passages in the early prophets and historical books have been pointed to, exhibiting, it is alleged, acquaintance with Dt. These resolve themselves into three cases. (1) Passages in which a law codified in Dt. is referred to (2 K. 14^{6}: Dt. 24^{16}), or may be presupposed, as Am. 3^{9} 4^{1} *oppress* (Dt. 24^{14}); 8^{5b} (25^{14}); Hos. 4^{14} ($23^{18(17)}$); 5^{10} (19^{14}); 9^{4} (26^{14}); Nah. 2^{1} (1^{15}) ($23^{22(21)}$); 1 S. 28^{3} (18^{11}); 1 K. 21^{10} (19^{15}). As pointed out above, however, Dt. embodies laws of much greater antiquity than itself: a statement harmonizing with a law of Dt. is therefore no evidence of the existence of Deuteronomy itself.* (2) Passages in which the expression—

* Censures on practices forbidden in *Ex.*, as well as in Dt.—as Am. 2^{8} Ex. $22^{25(26)}$ Dt. $24^{12f.}$; Am. 5^{12} Is. 10^{2} 29^{21} (unjust judgment) Ex. 23^{6} Dt. 16^{19}; Is. $1^{17.23}$ 10^{2} (fatherless and widow) Ex. $22^{21(22)}$ Dt. 24^{17}; Is. 1^{23} 5^{23} (bribery) Ex. 23^{8} Dt. 16^{19}; Nah. 3^{4} (sorceries) Ex. $22^{17(18)}$ Dt. 18^{10}—naturally prove

Digitized by Google

or sometimes only the thought—more or less resembles one occurring in Dt., as Am. 4^{9} *blasting and mildew* (Dt. 28^{22}); 4^{10} (28^{27}); 4^{11} *overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrha* ($29^{22\,(23)}$); 5^{7} 6^{12} *wormwood* ($29^{17\,(18)}$); 5^{11} *have built houses, &c.* ($28^{30.\,39}$); 9^{14} *turn the captivity* (30^{3}); Hos. 5^{11} *oppressed, crushed in judgment* (28^{33}); 7^{10} *returned, sought* ($4^{29.\,30}$); 7^{13} *ransom* (7^{8} &c.); 8^{1} *eagle* (28^{49}); 8^{13} *they shall return to Egypt* (28^{68}); 9^{12} (28^{41} 31^{17}); 11^{8} *Admah and Ẓeboim* ($29^{22\,(23)}$); Is. 1^{2} (32^{1}; 14^{1} $32^{5.\,20}$ *children*); 1^{4} *forsaken* J. (28^{20} 31^{16}), *despised* (31^{20}); &c. These are not sufficient to establish an acquaintance with Dt. on the part of the author quoted: most of the expressions are not peculiar to the passages cited, but are found elsewhere: few, if examined, will be found to be so distinctive that they might not readily occur to different writers independently; * and if now and then the case should seem to be otherwise, and to require a fundamental passage on which the others are based, there is no reason (apart from the assumption that Dt. is the earlier) why this should not be the passage in the prophet, with which the author of Dt. (if he lived subsequently) would naturally be familiar. Given merely two similar passages, nothing is more difficult than to determine, on internal grounds only, which is the original and which is the imitation, or reminiscence, of the other; and there is nothing in the parallels quoted from Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, &c.—even where dependence, on one side or the other, may be reasonably assumed—to make it more probable that they depend upon Dt. than that Dt. depends upon them. Jeremiah is the earliest prophet who can be demonstrated to have been acquainted with Deuteronomy. (3) There are numerous passages in Jos., Jud., Kings, in which the phraseology is palpably moulded upon that of Dt., and which, therefore, undoubtedly presuppose it.† The literary analysis of the books in question shows, however, that these passages do not belong to the original sources of which the books are composed, but are additions made by the compilers, who cannot be shown to have lived before the age in which Dt. was promulgated.

3. The acquaintance displayed in Dt. with Egyptian customs is said to be an indication that the author is Moses. But the references are far too insignificant and slight to prove this. Even though it be true—as, at least in some of the instances, it probably is true—that the customs alluded to in 6^{9} $25^{2.\,4}$ 26^{14} 27^{2b} (see the notes) are derived from Egypt, there is no evidence that they were intrôduced in Moses' time; and if they were, the mention of a custom by a particular author is obviously no proof that he was a *contemporary* of its introduction. The allusions to Egyptian peculiarities in 11^{10} and 7^{15} $28^{27.\,60}$ are not more marked than the one in Amos 8^{8}, and not so minute as those in Is. 19: intercourse with Egypt, as many indica-

---

nothing as to the existence of Dt. In some cases, also,—where, *viz.* (as Am. 3^{9} 4^{1} 8^{5} Hos. 4^{14}), the prophet's words could be reasonably accounted for by his own moral enlightenment,—it is far from clear that a particular law is either alluded to or presupposed at all.

* *Wormwood*, for instance, occurs also Jer. 9^{14} 23^{15} Lam. $3^{15.\,19}$ Pr. 5^{4}; *turn the captivity* repeatedly (see note *ad loc.*); *oppress* and *crush* (עשק and רצץ) are coupled together in 1 S. $12^{3.\,4}$ Am. 4^{1} (cf. Jer. 22^{17}).

† *L.O.T.* pp. 97 ff., 154–158, 175, 180 f., 190–193.

tions show, did not cease immediately after the Exodus (comp. *e.g.* during the period of the monarchy, 1 K. 3^{1} $10^{28f.}$ 11^{40}; Hos. 7^{11} 12^{1b} 2 K. 17^{4}; and the many allusions in Isaiah to friendly relations between Judah and Egypt, $20^{5f.}$ $30^{1-5.\,6-7}$ 31^{1-3} 36^{6} &c.).

Deuteronomy did not complete its work at once. The reformation of Josiah, as Jeremiah witnesses, could not change the habits of the people; under the subsequent kings, the old idolatries again prevailed. But on all the spiritually-minded Israelites Deuteronomy had laid its hold: Jeremiah, on nearly every page, bears testimony to its influence; * the compilers of Judges and Kings (who wrote at about the same time) show that by the contemporary prophets it was accepted as the religious standard of the age. The exile, sealing as it did the prophetical verdict on Israel's history, confirmed still further the authority of Deuteronomy. An official, *written* document now existed, accessible to all, regulating the life of the community, and determining the public standard of belief and practice. From the day when Dt. was accepted by king and people, Israel became—to borrow Moḥammed's expression—the "people of a book." In this book the rights of the sanctuary and of the priesthood were defined; the conditions which members of the "holy people" must satisfy were prescribed; the foundations of a *church* were thus outlined. The movement of which Dt. was the outcome ended, however, in consequences which were not foreseen by those who had initiated it. It was the *intention* of Dt. to deepen and spiritualize the religious life: but the necessity (p. xxix) of centralizing religious rites tended to formalize them, and to substitute a fixed routine for spontaneity. Sacrifices, pilgrimages, and other religious offices, hitherto often performed, as occasion required, at the village *Bāmāh*, were now all transferred to the central sanctuary: the Temple and its priesthood rose accordingly in importance. Highly as Dt. ranked the prophet (18^{20-22}), the step had been taken which in time would supersede the need of his living voice: a sacred book, of which the priests soon became the natural guardians and

* Comp. 11^{1-8}, where he undertakes a mission "in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem," with the object of securing obedience to a "covenant," which is evidently that of Dt. (Cheyne, *Jerem.* p. 56).

Digitized by Google

exponents, was now there, to become the rule of Israel's life. The promulgation of Dt. thus promoted indirectly that development of priestly aims and principles which ended in the legislation of P, and was one of the steps by which the religion of the prophets was transformed gradually into Judaism.*

The question arises, Is the existing book of Dt. identical with the law-book found by Ḥilḳiah? Or has it undergone subsequent expansion, in the manner of many other ancient Hebrew writings? And if there are reasons to suppose the latter to have been the case, is it possible to determine how much the "original Deuteronomy" may have comprised?

The central and principal discourse of Dt. consists, as explained above (p. ii), of c. 5–26. 28 (with perhaps $27^{9\text{-}10}$ as a connecting link),†—c. 5–11 being a parenetic introduction, c. 12–26 containing the exposition of the law, c. 28 forming the peroration and conclusion. There is no sufficient reason for doubting that the whole of these chapters formed part of the law-book found by Ḥilḳiah: all are written in the same style, and all breathe the same spirit, the only material difference being that, from the nature of the case, the parenetic phraseology is not so *exclusively* predominant in c. 12–26. 28 as it is in c. 5–11.

It is true, Wellh. (*Comp.* p. 193 f.: so Cornill, *Einl.* § 9. 2 *end*, 6) would limit the original Dt. to c. 12–26; but upon grounds which cannot be deemed cogent. The frequent inculcation, for instance, in c. 5–11 of statutes, the contents of which are not stated, but which are referred to as if they were familiar to the reader, does not show that c. 12–26 already lay before the author in a written form; it is sufficiently accounted for by the fact that the author *ex hypothesi* has throughout in mind the second part of his discourse, which is to follow, and bring with it the requisite explanations.

* On the historical significance of Deuteronomy, comp. further Wellh. *Hist.* pp. 32 ff., 76 ff., 402 ff., 487 f.; Stade, *Gesch.* i. 661–670; Smend, *Alttest. Rel.-gesch.* pp. 284–292, 303; Westphal, pp. 157 f., 244–246; Cornill, *Der Isr. Prophetismus*, pp. 84–91. See also Ryle, *Canon*, p. 63 ff.

† The rest of c. 27 is admittedly misplaced (see p. 294 f.).

Digitized by Google

Nor can it be said that c. 5–11 is disproportionately long as an introduction to c. 12–26, or that the promise of 5^{1} 6^{1} is separated by an undue interval from its redemption in c. 12–26: as has been pointed out before (p. xix), it is the grounds and motives of obedience which are of paramount value in the Writer's eye; even in c. 12–26 he constantly reverts to them; and hence it is not more than consistent with his sense of their importance that he should develop them systematically in a special introduction. In language and style there is nothing in c. 5–11 to suggest a different author from 12–26: as Kuenen has remarked, the two groups of chapters "present just that degree of agreement and difference which we should be justified in expecting, on the hypothesis of a common origin": naturally, the legislative terminology of c. 12–26 does not occur in c. 5–11; but in other respects, while c. 5–11 shows no traces of servile imitation, in tone and style it resembles entirely the parenetic parts of c. 12–26, and nearly all the distinctive expressions occurring in the latter are found in it likewise (see the list, p. lxxviii ff.).* It is more difficult to *demonstrate* that c. 28 is by the same author as c. 12–26, as the argument from phraseology, though strong, is not so cogent as in the case of c. 5–11; but the deviations from the normal Deuteronomic style may be safely said to be not greater than can be naturally accounted for by the special character of the contents.†

* The common origin of c. 5–11 and c. 12–26 is strongly defended by Kuenen, *Hex.* § 7. 5–11; Dillm. p. 263; Westphal, p. 105 ff. One of Kuenen's notes (n. 9), on account of the delicate literary feeling which it displays, is worthy of transcription: "Especially noteworthy, I think, is the resemblance between 18^{16-20} and the hortatory introduction. In v.^{16} בחרב as 5^{2} 9^{8}; ביום הקהל as 9^{10} 10^{4}, cf. $5^{19\,(22)}$; לא אסף, cf. $5^{22\,(25)}$; 'this great fire,' as $5^{22\,(25)}$, cf. מתוך האש $5^{4.\,23\,(26)}$ 9^{10} 10^{4}; ולא אמות, cf. $5^{22\,(25)}$; v.^{17} היטיב as $5^{25\,(28)}$. Yet it cannot be said that the author of c. 5–11 is simply borrowing from $18^{16\text{ff.}}$, for he moves quite freely, and never touches upon the thesis of the latter passage about prophecy as a substitute for Yahwè's immediate revelation. It is the *same author* who describes the assembly at Ḥoreb in c. 5, mentions it incidentally in c. 9–10, and makes an independent use of it in c. 18."

† Comp. Kuenen, § 7. 21 (2), who observes that he "cannot discover a single indication of diverse authorship in the chap.," though he allows the contents to be of a nature inviting expansion. Dillm. (p. 370), on the

Digitized by Google

The following are passages of c. 12–26, which have been deemed by some scholars, on various grounds, to be later additions (cf. Wellh. *Comp.* pp. 194 f., 353; Cornill, *Einl.* § 9. 2):—$12^{5-7. 15-19}$ $14^{1-2. 4-20}$ (the *detailed* enumeration not in the general style of D) ^{21b} ("for . . . God") 15^{4-6} 16^{3-4} (in conflict with v.^{8}, and a correction of it introduced on the basis of Ex. 12^{15-20} $13^{6f.}$ Lev. 23^{6} Nu. 28^{18}), 17^{8-13} (the priests) $^{14-20}$ (v.^{18}, it is said, presupposes Dt. to be *already* written, and in the custody of the priests, $31^{9. 26}$) 18^{14-22} 20 21^{5} $23^{5-7\,(4-6)}$. But the grounds cannot be considered cogent; and the passages demurred to (esp. 17^{14-20}), with the single exception of 14^{4-20}, which explains itself, harmonize entirely in style and character with the rest of Dt. (cf. Kuen. §§ 7. 11; 14. 1). See more fully Holzinger, pp. 262–265, 292–295; also Piepenbring, *Revue de l'Hist. des Religions*, xxix. (1894) p. 123 ff. (a criticism of an allied theory of L. Horst's).

C. 5–26 may thus be concluded, without hesitation, to be the work of a single author; and c. 28 may be included without serious misgivings. The question becomes more difficult when we proceed to consider c. 1–4 and c. 29–34.

(1) c. 1–4. The majority of recent critics attribute these chaps. to a different hand from the body of Dt. (c. 5–26. 28), supposing them to have been prefixed, as an introduction, shortly after that was completed, by a writer belonging to the same school, for the purpose of providing the reader with an account of the historical antecedents of the Deut. legislation (c. 1–3), and at the same time of inculcating fresh motives for obedience (4^{1-40}).* The question was made, a few years ago, the subject of a rather interesting discussion. A. van Hoonacker (Professor at Louvain) in three articles in *Le Muséon*, vii. (1888) pp. 464–482, viii. (1889) pp. 67–85, 141–149,† subjected the arguments of Reuss and Kuenen to a searching criticism, with the view of showing that c. 1–4 were by the same author as c. 5–26. 28; and his articles were in

ground of its literary character (repetitions, and points of contact with Jer.), considers that this has certainly taken place; but he admits that it is not possible to distinguish now what the additions are. The rhetorical completeness and force, and the unity of treatment, which mark the chap., as a whole, make it difficult to think that the additions, if any, can extend beyond two or three isolated verses (cf. below, p. 303 f.).

* Klostermann, *Stud. u. Kr.* 1871, p. 253 ff. (=*Der Pent.* p. 228 ff.); Wellh. *Comp.* pp. 191, 193, 195; Reuss, *La Bible* (1879), i. 207; Valeton, *Studiën*, vi. 303 f., vii. 225; Kuenen, *Hex.* § 7. 12–17; Westphal (1892), ii. 66–68, 80–90; König, *Einl.* p. 212 f.; Cornill, § 9. 5; Wildeboer, § 11. 3.

† Published since separately under the title, *L'origine des quatre premiers chapitres du Deutéronome*, Louvain, 1889.

Digitized by Google

their turn criticized from the opposite point of view by L. Horst in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, xxiii. (1891) p. 184 ff. The fairness and good temper of both writers are not more conspicuous than their ability: the following is an outline of the arguments alleged.

1. The two superscriptions $1^{1-2.\,4-5}$ * and 4^{44-49}, each stating with some circumstantiality the place and occasion of the delivery of the following discourse, are mutually exclusive, and cannot both be the work of the same author: would the author of $1^{1-2.\,4-5}$ have repeated substantially the same particulars in 4^{44-49}? or does 4^{44-49} read like the words of one who had already written the previous title $1^{1-2.\,4-5}$, and just related at length (c. 2–3) the details summarized in it? Van Hoonacker, in reply, contends that, if 1^{1}–4^{43} were the work of a later author than 4^{44}–c. 26, he would, if he had felt 4^{44-49} to be injurious to the unity of the entire book, either have cancelled it, or (preferably) have *preserved* it, as the original title, inserting his own introduction (1^{6}–4^{40}) after it; and urges that the new heading, 4^{44-49}, is rendered necessary by the interruption occasioned by 4^{41-43} (cities of refuge); its circumstantiality is due to the love of repetition (especially on the conquest of the trans-Jordanic territory) which characterizes the author of Dt. Horst replies that it is more than doubtful if 4^{41-43} is an original part of Dt.; † and that if it were, the opening words of 5^{1}, "And Moses called unto all Israel, and said unto them," would be a sufficient introduction to what follows, after the interruption.—It does not seem that any definite conclusion as to the authorship of 1^{1}–4^{40} can be drawn from the occurrence of the double title. As the two headings stand, in spite of what van Hoonacker urges, they cannot well be both the work of the same writer; but a heading lends itself readily to expansion; and if, as seems to be the case, 4^{49} is based upon 3^{17}, which forms (see note) part of an *insertion* in the original text of c. 1–3, 4^{44-49}, in its present form, *must* be of later origin than c. 1–3. There is nothing unreasonable in the supposition that, as formulated by the original author (whether preceded by 4^{41-43} or not), this title was considerably briefer than it now is, and not longer than was sufficient to mark the commencement of the actual "exposition" of the law, promised in 1^{5}, as opposed to the introductory matter contained in 1^{6}–4^{40}.

2. Inconsistencies alleged to exist between c. 1–4 and c. 5–26:—

(*a*) In 2^{14-16} it is said that all the generation which rebelled at Kadesh had perished in the wilderness; but in $5^{2f.}$ 11^{2-7} stress is laid on the fact that those whom Moses is addressing are witnesses of the Exodus, and

---

* V.[3] belongs to P (p. 7).

† See below, p. 78. Van Hoonacker argues that in c. 19 the Writer confines himself to the three cities of refuge to be instituted in Canaan, those appointed on the E. of Jordan having been already noticed by him in 4^{41-43}; but it remains strange, as Horst remarks, that when contemplating their possible future augmentation by three more (v.[8f.]), he should make no allusion to those which he had mentioned in 4^{41-43}.

Digitized by Google

belong to the same generation with which Jehovah had made a covenant at Ḥoreb. Kuenen argues, "The author of c. 5–11 is aware that the recipients of the Deut. legislation are not in fact identical with the witnesses of the theophany at Ḥoreb (see $8^{2.\,15}$ 11^{5} &c.), but nevertheless he wishes to *identify* them with them. The author of c. 1–4, on the other hand, is particularly anxious to *distinguish* them. Is it not clear that he cannot be also the author of c. 5–11?" It is replied: (1) the terms of $2^{14\text{-}16}$ are limited to the "men of war," *i.e.* to the adult males; and a fair proportion of those under twenty in the 2nd year of the Exodus, would be alive still, 38 years afterwards. (2) It is admittedly the practice of Dt. to comprehend the past, the present, and the future generations of Israel in an *ideal* unity, and so to treat, for instance, the Israelites addressed by Moses as morally identical with those who came out of Egypt, or rebelled in the wilderness (*e.g.* $5^{20\,(23)}$ 7^{19} $9^{7f.\,22f.}$ $25^{17f.}$: comp. *before your eyes*, 4^{34b} 6^{22} 9^{17} $29^{1\,(2)}$): the point of 5^{3} is to insist on the fact that the covenant concluded at Ḥoreb is not an ancient covenant, made with "our fathers," *i.e.* with the patriarchs, but is one binding on the Israel of to-day, the Israel whose separate national existence, and national consciousness, began at the Exodus; and in 11^{2} the allusion to "your children who have not known," &c., is merely intended rhetorically, for the purpose of emphasizing the appeal to those who stood nearer to the events described, and the younger of whom, in the conception of the writer, had actually witnessed them. The author of c. 1–4 is not more anxious than the author of c. 5–11 to distinguish the two generations: in $2^{14\text{-}16}$, speaking *historically*, he states that the generation which rebelled at Ḳadesh had perished; but elsewhere he expresses himself in terms similar to those of 5^{3} 11^{2}: so, for instance, not only in the appeal of $4^{9\text{-}12.\,32f.\,34b.\,35f.}$, but also in 1^{9} ("unto you") $^{19.\,20.\,22.\,26.\,46}$. One who assigns (as Kuenen does) c. 1–4 to a single author, cannot therefore (on this ground) argue logically that c. 1–3 is by a different hand from c. 5–11.

(*b*) The Moabites and Edomites, who are placed on the *same* footing in 2^{29}, are placed on a *different* footing in $23^{4f.\,8f.\,(3f.\,7f.)}$: in 2^{29} they are both praised for having sold the Israelites bread and water, when they were journeying past their territory; in $23^{4f.\,(3f.)}$ the Moabites are said *not* to have met the Israelites with bread and water, and while the Edomites (v.$^{8f.\,(7f.)}$) are commended to the Israelites' favourable regard, the Moabites (v.$^{4.\,7\,(3.\,6)}$) are expressly excluded from it.

Van Hoonacker replies that $23^{5\,(4)a}$ refers only to the *Ammonites* (v.$^{4\,(3)}$) —v.$^{5b\text{-}6\,(4b\text{-}5)}$ referring to the Moabites,—an interpretation which Horst (p. 197) allows may be right. He points out further that the occasion of $23^{4f.\,(3f.)}$ cannot have been the one alluded to in 2^{29}: the unfriendly action of the Moabites in hiring Bala'am (Nu. 22–24) must have been after the message to Siḥon (Dt. 2^{28}: Nu. 21^{21}), and *à fortiori* after the friendliness alluded to in Dt. 2^{29}, which must have been at the time of Nu. $21^{11\text{-}13}$. And the injunctions in $23^{8f.\,(7f.)}$ are based, not upon Edom's treatment of Israel in the wilderness, but upon its being Israel's "brother,"—a relationship not subsisting in the case of Moab.

3. As regards $4^{1\text{-}40}$, it is urged that the connexion with c. 1–3 is loose: $4^{1ff.}$ is in no way the sequel of c. 3: "rien, dans la partie historique [c. 1–3],

Digitized by Google

qui prépare au discours [4^{1-40}]; rien, dans le discours, qui rappelle la partie historique. Celui-ci tire bien plûtot ses développements des portions du Deutéronome qui viennent après lui."* C. 1–3 are historical, and not parenetic: c. 4 is parenetic; and the motives appealed to, in so far as they are drawn from the history (v.$^{3f.\ 9ff.\ 23.\ 24ff.}$), are derived, not from the retrospect of c. 1–3, but from incidents not there noticed. The main theme of c. 4 is an expansion of the second commandment of the Decalogue (with 4^{9-28}, cf. $5^{8f.}$; with 4^{32-40}, 5^{7}): the author thus takes a special point in c. 5, which he develops in the form of an introduction to it. He thus wrote with c. 5 ff. before him (as is shown also by the expression *have taught* in v.^{5}).

C. 4, however (as van Hoonacker points out), does begin just where c. 3 breaks off (cf. 4^{3} with 3^{29}); and the statement that c. 1–3 is not parenetic is exaggerated: indirectly, and so far as is consistent with the character of a retrospect, it is parenetic (p. xvii). If, as is probable, the Deut. legislation was published originally as a separate manual, it would not be more than natural for it to be provided with an historical introduction, recapitulating the events which brought Israel to the spot (3^{29}) at which its promulgation by Moses is located, and setting before the people the lessons and warnings which the history suggested (cf. Oettli, p. 10). It is true that the historical incidents noticed in c. 1–3 are not utilized in 4^{1-40}; but is it necessary that they should be? The writer, in view of Israel's having been led safely by Jehovah to the borders of the Promised Land, exhorts the people to lay to heart the practical duties devolving in consequence upon them ("And now," 4^{1}: cf. 10^{12}); and imperfect conceptions of the spiritual nature of God being the obstacle most likely to impede Israel in doing this, he dwells upon such incidents of the history—notably the theophany at Ḥoreb—as seemed to him best adapted to correct them. No doubt this is an expansion of 5^{8-10}; but it does not show that c. 5 ff. lay before him in a written form: the Decalogue he would of course be acquainted with independently, and the fact that it follows immediately afterwards may be taken as an indication that it was already in his mind as he wrote.

As regards *have taught* in 4^{5}, van Hoonacker adopts the same view that is taken in the present commentary (p. 64: so Kön. *Einl.* p. 213 *n.*), that the reference is to prior, less formal and systematic announcements of the Deut. laws, which (in the conception of the writer) Moses had made from time to time to the people; Dt. being the final and comprehensive summary of them. Horst (p. 187 f.) indeed objects (cf. Reuss, i. 165 f., ii. 289 *n.*; Kuen. §§ 3. 11; 13. 32, 1) that Dt. never mentions or implies that anything beyond the Decalogue had been previously communicated by Moses to the people: the aim of $5^{19\,(22)ff.}$ is to show that the laws received by Israel through Moses came with the same authority as those spoken by God Himself; these laws, however, are intended only to come into force in *Canaan* ($4^{5.\,14}$ $5^{28\,(31)}$ 6^{1} 12^{1}); and $5^{28\,(31)}$ 6^{1} imply that they are now,

* Westphal, p. 67, who cites, as illustrations (amongst other passages), v.^{1} ("Hear, O Israel"), cf. 5^{1} 6^{4} &c.; v.^{2}, alluding to 13^{1} (12^{32}); v.^{5} ("*I have taught* you," &c.), alluding to c. 5–26; v.^{10}, cf. $6^{7.\,10}$ 11^{19}; v.^{13}, cf. 9^{9} &c.; v.^{29} ("with all thy heart," &c.), cf. 6^{5} 10^{12} &c.

Digitized by Google

when the people are on the point of entering Canaan, placed before them for the first time. It may be doubted whether this interpretation does not unduly strain the terms of $5^{28(31)}$ 6^{1}: the alternative view, which is not unreasonable in itself, can hardly be said to be excluded by the language of Dt., while $5^{24(27)b}$ (cf. 1^{18})—to say nothing of Ex. 24^{3}—supports it.

4. While the general similarity of style between c. 1–4 (esp. c. 4) and c. 5–26. 28, is not denied, there are expressions in c. 1–4 not occurring elsewhere in Dt., which, it is said, confirm the view that it is the work of a different hand. Kuen. (§ 7. 15) instances יְרֻשָּׁה *possession* $2^{5.9.9.12.19.19}$ 3^{20} (hence Jos. 1^{15}. The word occurs also Jos. $12^{6.7}$ Jud. 21^{17} Jer. 32^{8} Ps. 61^{6} 2 Ch. 20^{11}†); התגרה *to provoke* $2^{5.9.19.24}$ (not elsewhere in the Hex.); התחנן *to supplicate* 3^{23} (also 1 Ki. $8^{33.47.59}$ [Deut.] *al.*); התעבר *to be enraged* 3^{26}; כור הברזל *iron-furnace* 4^{20}; עם נחלה *people of inheritance* 4^{20}; לב for לבב (the usual Deut. word: p. lxxxvii) 4^{11}: there are also some points of contact with the phraseology of Ez. and P (*ib.* § 16. 12 *a*), viz. פסל 4^{16}, זכר ונקבה 4^{17}, צפור כנף 4^{17}, תבנית $4^{17.18}$, רמש 4^{18}, הוליד 4^{25}, נושן 4^{25}, ברא אלהים 4^{32}. *Amorite* in $1^{7.19.20.27.44}$ 3^{9} is said also to be used in a different application from 7^{1} 20^{17}.

The literary features thus noted as distinguishing c. 1–4 from c. 5–26, are, it must be owned, relatively slight. The most remarkable one is certainly יְרֻשָּׁה,—the more so, as the verb ירש is particularly frequent in c. 5–26 (p. lxxviii ff., Nos. 4, 22, 46).* In the case of the rest, it may be reasonably said of some that there was no occasion for their use in c. 5–26, and of others (notably those in 4^{17-18}) that they occur in connexion with the subject-matter: while others again are not more indicative of the separate authorship of c. 1–4 than those found only in c. 5–11 (as שנן 6^{7}, בצק 8^{4}, הדף 6^{19} 9^{4}) are—as Kuen. also allows (above, p. lxix)—of the separate authorship of these chapters.† On the other hand, the general style of 4^{1-40} is indistinguishable from that of c. 5–26; and it includes, not merely the broader features of the Deuteronomic style‡ (which, it is true, lend themselves readily to adoption by different writers), but also minuter features: notice, for example:—1^{17} גור (18^{22}); 1^{27} שנאה (9^{28}); 1^{29} בצורות בשמים (9^{1}); 1^{29} ערץ (7^{21} 20^{3} 31^{6}); $1^{31\,end}$ *even unto* (עד) *this place* (9^{7} 11^{5}; cf. with אל *to* 26^{9} 29^{6}); 1^{43} הזיד (17^{13} 18^{20}); 2^{5} מדרך כף רגל (cf. 11^{24}); 2^{27} נטה *changed* to סור, the Deut.

---

* ירשה may, however, have been chosen as suggesting (agreeably with the context) more distinctly than נחלה (which is rather an inheritance as *held*) the idea of an inheritance as *succeeded to* (Jer. 32^{8}: cf. היורש the *heir*).

† With עם נחלה, cf. עמך ונחלתך $9^{26.29}$. It is true (p. lxxxvii), Dt. greatly prefers לבב to לב: but לב is generally used by preference in the *metaph.* sense of 4^{11} (2 S. 18^{14}; and in the phrase בלב ים Ex. 15^{8} Pr. 23^{34} 30^{19}, or בלב ימים Ez. $27^{4.25.26.27}$ $28^{2.8}$ Ps. 46^{3}; בלבב ימים only Jon. 2^{4}). And לבב occurs Dt. 2^{30} $4^{9.29.39}$. It is not clear that the use of *Amorite* in 1^{7} &c. is inconsistent with its use in the rhetorical enumerations 7^{1} 20^{17}: see pp. 11 f., 97.

‡ In the list, p. lxxviii ff., see (for c. 1–3) Nos. 17, 19, 25, 29, 47, 52, 53, 55; (for c. 4) Nos. 1*b*, 3*b*, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 22, 23, 28, 37, 41, 42, 45, 49, 51, 62, 68*b*, 69; (for both) Nos. 4, 11, 13, 15, 16, 21, 38, 40, 46, 58, 60, 65.—In 4^{40}, *six* of these are found together, forming almost the entire verse. In 4^{1-40} the sustained oratorical style—notice esp. v. $^{7-8.15-19.32-36}$—is also thoroughly Deuteronomic (comp. p. lxxxvii).

Digitized by Google

word (p. lxxxii, No. 53); 2^{30} אמץ לבב (15^{7}); 3^{24} גדל (5^{21} 9^{26} 11^{2}); 4^{9} אשר ראו עיניך (p. lxxxiii, No. 59); 4^{10b} (cf. 12^{1b}); 4^{19} נדח ($13^{6.11.14}$ 30^{17}; and cf. 17^{3}); 4^{27b} (cf. 28^{37b}): 4^{33} (cf. 13^{8} 28^{64}); 4^{34} מסות and מוראים (7^{19} 26^{8}). The *combination* of minuter and broader features constitutes an argument of some weight, in favour of the unity of authorship.*

Except for those who hold that Dt. is the work of Moses, the question of the authorship of 1^{1}–4^{40} is of subordinate importance. Even if it be rightly assigned to a different hand from c. 5–26. 28, the conclusion does not rest upon a multitude of convergent indications, such as give cogency to all the broader and important results of the critical study of the Old Testament. Nor, in any case, can it have been written more than a few years after the body of Dt. To the present writer there appears to be no conclusive reason why c. 1–3 should not be by the same hand as c. 5 ff.; and the only reason of any weight for doubting whether 4^{1-40} is by the same hand also, seems to him to be one which after all may not be conclusive either, viz. that the author of c. 5–26, desiring to say what now forms 4^{1-40}, might have been expected, instead of inserting it between c. 1–3 and the body of his discourse (c. 5 ff.), to have incorporated it, with his other similar exhortations, in the latter.

Dillm., for the purpose of explaining the phenomena presented by these chapters, makes the clever and original suggestion that 1^{6}–3^{29} was in the first instance written as an historical introduction to c. 5–26. 28 by the author himself (in the *third* person): this introduction the redactor who incorporated Dt. in the Pent. was unable to retain in that shape (for it

---

* H. G. Mitchell (*JBLit.* 1888, p. 156 ff.) adds, as characteristic of the Deut. style, and found also in c. 1–4: אבד *perish* (esp. with the inf. abs.*), 4^{26*} 7^{20} $8^{19.*20}$ 11^{17} (Jos. $23^{13.16}$ D²), $28^{20.22}$ 30^{18*}; גדול *great*, either alone or with other attributives, for rhetorical effect; alone—2^{7} $4^{6.7.8.32.34.36.37}$ $5^{19(22).22(25)}$ $7^{19.23}$ 9^{29} 11^{7} 18^{16} 26^{8} $29^{2.2.23.27}$ 34^{12}; in such phrases as *great and tall* (or *many*, &c.), $1^{19.28}$ $2^{10.21}$ 4^{38} $6^{10.22}$ 7^{21} 8^{15} $9^{1.1.2}$ $10^{17.21}$ 11^{23} 26^{5} 28^{59}; זה ארבעים שנה 2^{7} $8^{2.4}$; *Ḥoreb* (p. xv *bottom*); וְיָדַעְתָּ introducing a solemn declaration, 4^{39} 7^{9} 8^{5} $9^{3.6}$; so וידעתם 11^{2} (Jos. 23^{14} D²); מהר *adv.* 4^{26} $7^{4.22}$ $9^{3.12a.12b}$ (from Ex. 32^{8}; so v.[16]), 28^{20}; בעת ההיא *at that time* $1^{9.16.18}$ 2^{34} $3^{4.8.12.18.21.23}$ 4^{14} 5^{5} 9^{20} $10^{1.8}$: רְאֵה *see!* as an excl., $1^{8.21}$ $2^{24.31}$ 4^{5} 11^{26} 30^{15} (but also in D² Jos. 6^{2} 8^{1}; Ex. 7^{1} *al.*); המרה את פי י׳ $1^{26.43}$ 9^{23} (but cf. Jos. 1^{18} D²; 1 S. 12^{14} Deut.), sq. עם $9^{7.24}$ 31^{27}. Some other expressions cited *ibid.*, as הלך אחרי 4^{3}, הכעים (4^{25} 9^{18}; but see 2 K. 17^{17}), are too little distinctive to be really evidence of a single author. And, in general, expressions used by *other Deuteronomic writers* have not the full cogency of those confined to Dt. 5–26. 28 itself.

Digitized by Google

would then have read too much like a repetition of parts of Ex. Nu.), but being unwilling to sacrifice it (for it contained many notices not to be found in the existing Ex. Nu.), he altered its form, changing the third person into the first, or second, and so preserved it as a discourse of Moses. This hypothesis accounts for both the resemblances between 1^{6}–3^{29} and c. 5–26, and the differences: the resemblances are due to the fact that the original author is the same; the differences are due to additions, or changes, introduced by the redactor, in the process of transforming the narrative into a discourse. As regards 4^{1-40} Dillm. considers that this resembles (in style and tone) c. 5–26 too closely to be the work of a different hand; he conjectures therefore that it is the work of D, but that it formed originally (with portions of c. 29–30: p. lxxiv) part of a closing hortatory discourse (following c. 5–26. 28: hence *have taught* in v.^{5}), and was transferred here, as a conclusion to c. 1–3, by the same redactor who incorporated Dt. in the Pent.

Westphal (pp. 87–103) adopts a similar view; but he thinks (on the ground of the double introduction $1^{1-2.\,4-5}$ and 4^{44-49}) that the author of 1^{6}–3^{29} in its original form was not the author of c. 5–26, but a somewhat later Deuteronomic writer, who composed a separate, independent narrative, describing briefly the Exodus and the conquest of Canaan; the final redactor of the Hexateuch, sacrificing the individuality of his sources to chronological order, transferred the first part of this narrative (changing at the same time the 3rd person into the first) to its proper chronological position, before c. 5–26. 28, and worked up the second part into c. 27. 31. 34, and the Book of Joshua (the Deuteronomic sections).

It may be doubted whether such complicated hypotheses are required by the facts; that of Dillm. is criticized by van Hoonacker in *Le Muséon*, viii. (1889) p. 141 ff. Both, in the view taken of 4^{1-40}, are connected with theories of the original arrangement of c. 29–31, which will be considered directly. The proper position of 4^{1-40}—with its allusions to Ḥoreb, and its treatment of a *fundamental* principle of Dt., viz. the spirituality of God—seems certainly to be *before* c. 5–26. 28, rather than after it.

(2) c. 29–34. The parts of these chapters which have chiefly to be considered are c. 29–30. $31^{1-13.\,24-30}$ 32^{45-47}—the rest being admittedly derived from other sources. The following are the principal grounds upon which it is questioned whether these passages formed part of the original Deuteronomy:—

1. Though Deuteronomic words and phrases abound,* the tone on the whole (except in 30^{11-20}) is not quite that of Dt. itself, and several expressions occur, which are not found elsewhere in Dt. (see p. 320).

2. The connexion is sometimes imperfect, not only between $29^{18-20\,(19-21)}$ (an individual), and $29^{21\,(22)\,ff.}$ (the entire nation), but especially between 30^{1-10} and $30^{11\,ff.}$ (see p. 331), making it next to impossible that 30^{1-10} can have stood originally in its present place.

* See the citations from these chapters, p. lxxviii ff.

Digitized by Google

3. $29^{19. 26 (20. 27)}$ 30^{10} speak of Dt. as already "written," anticipating thereby 31^{9}.*

4. The standpoint is in parts of c. 29–30 different from what it is in the body of Dt. In the body of Dt. (c. 5–26. 28), the two alternatives—obedience, resulting in national prosperity, and disobedience, resulting in national disaster—are balanced one against the other; one is not represented as more likely to follow than the other (cf. $28^{1ff. 15ff.}$); in $29^{21 (22)}$–30^{10} the latter is tacitly assumed to have been realized, and the fulfilment of the curse ($29^{21-28 (22-29)}$) is made the point of departure for the hopes of penitence and promise of restoration afterwards (30^{1-10}). This is the capital difference which distinguishes c. 29–30 from c. 28. What encouragement, then, or inducement to obedience, it is asked, would it be to the people, "to assure it thus distinctly that its apostasy was inevitable, to hold out to it beforehand the picture of its ruin, and to announce to it, before even it has deserved the punishment, the conditions upon which it might be again received into God's favour?" †

5. From the terms of 32^{45-47}, taken in conjunction with 31^{28-29} (in both of which, it is said, the Song 32^{1-43} is ignored, and the expression "(all) these words," at least in 32^{45}, must refer to some commendation of the Deut. law), it is argued by Dillm. that there followed originally in Dt., after the account of Moses' writing the Deuteronomic law, and delivering it to the priests (31^{9-13}), a final hortatory discourse, addressed to the people, and commending it to their observance. This discourse Dillm. considers is to be found in parts of c. 29–30, and c. 4 (which has several points of contact with c. 29–30: Westphal, pp. 69–73); the redactor, who combined Dt. with JE and the Song (32^{1-43}), having before him both this final discourse and the Song, conceived the idea of treating the two as parallel; hence he remodelled the discourse, with such changes and additions as to transform it into a "witness" ($31^{28f.}$) against Israel in the event of its future apostasy. Upon Dillm.'s view, the main discourse of Dt. (c. 5–26. 28) was followed originally, first by $31^{9-13. 24-26a}$ (the writing of Dt., and its delivery to the priests), then by the directions contained in 27^{1-4} and 11^{29-30}; after this by the final hortatory address, comprising 31^{28-29} (as an introduction), parts of c. 4 and c. 29, 30^{11-20},‡ and 32^{45-47} (as a conclusion); and by the notices 3^{21-28} 31^{1-8}, ending with D's account of Moses' death, contained in parts of c. 34. The additions introduced by the redactor into Moses' final discourse were especially 30^{1-10}, and parts of 4^{1-40}, which harmonize imperfectly with D's usual style (as expressions in v.$^{16. 17. 32}$, and v.$^{25. 28. 31}$).§

Westphal, developing this theory in greater detail, reconstructs the supposed final discourse as follows:—$29^{1-15 (2-14)}$ 4^{1-2} $29^{16-21 (17-22)}$ 4^{3-30a} 29^{22-28}

* Strictly, of course, "which I have *spoken*" should have been said. But the argument is hardly cogent; for, if Dt. was, from the first, a *written* book, the Writer, forgetful of his *rôle* (cf. 2^{12} 3^{8} [p. xliii]), might easily have used the expression. Cf. $28^{58. 61}$, which there is thus no need, with Dillm., to consider altered by the redactor.

† Westphal, p. 71 f.: cf. Wellh. *Comp.* p. 191; Kuen. § 7. 22 (4).

‡ 30^{19} being the appeal to heaven and earth, announced in 31^{28}.

§ Cf. Dillm. pp. 230 f. 251, 379, 386, 387, 390, 600 f.

Digitized by Google

$^{(23-29)}$ 4^{30b-31} 30^{1-10} 4^{32-40} 30^{11-20} 32^{45-47}; he attributes it, however, not to D himself, but to a follower, who he thinks attached it (with $31^{9-13.\ 24-29}$ as an introduction) to c. 5–26. 28, for the purpose of commending the Deut. law to the observance of Israel (pp. 60 f., 69).

Oettli (pp. 11–12) thinks that the original arrangement may have been :—c. 5–26. 28. $27^{1-3.\ 11-13}$ $31^{9-13.\ 24-29}$ 28^{69}–29^{27} (29^{1-28}) 30^{1-10} $29^{28\ (29)}$ 30^{11-20} 32^{45-47} 31^{1-8}, with $31^{14.\ 15.\ 23}$ (the parallel, from JE, to v.$^{1-8}$), and 31^{16-22} $32^{1-43.\ 44}$.

The transpositions and alterations, postulated by the theories of Dillm. and Westphal, are intrinsically improbable; and it is impossible to think that sufficient cause has been shown for having recourse to them. The explanation of 31^{28} 32^{46}, suggested in the Commentary, is surely easier: it is hardly likely that a prose passage, such as 30^{19}, would be specially announced by the words 31^{28}; and a reference in 31^{28} to the Song 32^{1-43} is after all more probable. 30^{11-20} has the genuine Deuteronomic ring; but 30^{1-10} (the passage which speaks of Israel's penitence after apostasy) connects so imperfectly with $30^{11ff.}$, that no doubt it is either (if written by D) misplaced, or is to be attributed to a different hand. As regards c. 29, it is in any case of the nature of a supplement —for the "Exposition of the Law," promised in 1^{5} (cf. 5^{1} 12^{1}) is completed in c. 5–26. 28; v.$^{21-28\ (22-29)}$ appear to go with 30^{1-10}; and as even in the rest of the chapter the phraseology is not altogether the same as in the body of Dt., it is not impossible that it is the work of a later Deuteronomic writer. This writer, it may be conjectured, partly with the view of insisting afresh upon the duty of observing the Deuteronomic law, partly for the purpose of completing the history of Moses, combined into a whole, with such additions as seemed to him to be needful, whatever concluding notices the author himself had attached to c. 5–26. 28, together with the excerpts from the narrative of JE, which belonged here.*

The structure of Dt. may be exhibited in a tabular form as follows:—

* The line dividing D and D^2 in c. 29–34 cannot be fixed with confidence: Jos. 1. 23 show how closely the style of Dt. may be imitated; and possibly most, or even all, of the Deut. parts of c. 29–34 should be assigned to D^2. The Deuteronomic sections of Joshua, it is observable (Hollenberg, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1874, pp. 472–506), display specially close affinities with Dt. 1-4, and the Deut. parts of c. 29–34. Cf. on $29^{1.\ 8-10}$ 31^{6-8}.

Digitized by Google

JE											27^{5-7a}	
D	1^{1-2}		1^4–3^{13}		3^{18}–4^{28}		4^{32-40}		5^1–26^{19}			
D²				3^{14-17}*		4^{29-31}†		$4^{41-43.\ 44-49}$		27‡$^{1-4}$		$^{7b-8}$.
P		1^3										

JE								31^{14-15}
D	27^{9-10}		c. 28 (28^1–29^1) $29^{1-8\ (2-9)}$			30^{11-20}	31^{1-13}	
D²		$27^{11-13.\ (14-26)}$		$^{9-28\ (10-29)}$	30^{1-10}†			
P								

JE		31^{23}					(c. 33‖) ¶34^{1a}
D			31^{24-27}		32^{45-47}		
D²	(31^{16-22}§)			31^{28-30} ($32^{1-43.\ 44}$§)			
P						32^{48-52}	

JE		34^{1b-5a}		6		10	
D							
D²							11-12.**
P	¶34^{1a}		5b		7-9		

* On the grounds for assigning this to D², see p. 54 ff.

† 4^{29-31} and 30^{1-10} are the only two passages of Dt. in which the ultimate repentance and restoration of Israel *after* its apostasy and exile are contemplated. They are assigned here—not without hesitation—to D², not on account of the incompatibility of such a prospect with the general point of view of Dt.,—for the author writes not merely as a legislator, but also as a prophet, announcing like other prophets (*e.g.* Jer. 29^{10-14}) Jehovah's counsels for His people's welfare; and the promise of ultimate restoration would not neutralize the motive to obedience which the prospect of such a disaster as antecedent exile would bring with it,—but on account of their imperfect connexion with the context: in each case, the paragraph which follows (4^{32-40}; 30^{11-20}) introduces the motive for a *present* duty (see 4^{39-40}; $30^{14.\ 16b.\ 20}$); in each case also it is introduced by "For," which accordingly must assign the ground, not for Jehovah's mercy in a distant future (4^{31}; 30^{3-9}), but for His claims upon Israel's obedience in the *present.* Unless therefore it may be supposed that the *For* of 4^{32} introduces the motive, not for v.$^{29-31}$, but for listening in general to the preceding exhortations and warnings, v.$^{15-28}$, and that 30^{1-10}, though written by D, has been misplaced, it seems that the promises contained in these two passages must be insertions in the original text of Dt., parallel in thought to Jer. 29^{10-14} 33^{6-13} &c., introduced by a later Deuteronomic hand (cf. König, *Einl.* p. 213. The explanation of *For* in 4^{32}, attempted in the Commentary, conceals the difficulty, and is not satisfactory).

‡ On the analysis of this chapter, see p. 294 ff.

§ Incorporated from an independent source. See pp. 338, 347.

‖ Incorporated into Dt. at an uncertain stage in the history of the text.

¶ On the grounds for the analysis of c. 34, see the notes *ad loc.* In v.^{1a} the part belonging to JE is "And Moses went up to the top of Pisgah"; the rest (to *Jericho*) is inserted from P.

** On the distinction of D and D² in c. 29-34, see p. lxxv, *note.* The style of 29^{1-8} 31^{1-8} is rather that of D² in Jos. than of Dt. itself.

Digitized by Google

The stages by which Dt. assumed its present form will thus have been (approximately) as follows:—Chronologically, the parts first written were the Blessing (c. 33), and the excerpts from JE (of course, in the original form of this document, with intermediate passages, completing the narrative, which have now been superseded by, or absorbed in, Dt.). The kernel of Dt. consists undoubtedly of c. 5–26. 28; and this, with short historical notices at the beginning (viz. 4^{44-49} in a briefer form) and end, constituted the law-book of Josiah. It was probably preceded by the parts of c. 1–4 noted in the Table; though most recent critics are of opinion that these chapters were prefixed to it afterwards. Some little time after the kernel of Dt. was composed, it was enlarged by a second Deuteronomic writer (or writers), D^2, who (1) supplemented the work of D by adding the passages indicated; (2) incorporated, with additions of his (or their) own, the excerpts from JE, and (taking it probably from a separate source) the Song 32^{1-43}, with the historical notices belonging to it, 31^{16-22} 32^{44}. Finally, at a still later date, the whole thus constituted was brought formally into relation with the literary framework of the Hexateuch as a whole by the addition of the extracts from P.

§ 5. *Language and Style.*

The literary style of Dt. is very marked and individual. In vocabulary, indeed, it presents comparatively few exceptional words (p. lxxxiv); but particular words, and phrases, consisting sometimes of entire clauses, recur with extraordinary frequency, giving a *distinctive colouring* to every part of the work. In its predominant features, the style of Dt. is strongly original, entirely unlike that of P, and very dissimilar to the normal style of JE. There are, however, certain sections of JE (in particular, Gn. 26^5 Ex. 13^{3-16} 15^{26} 19^{3-6}, parts of 20^{2-17}, 23^{20-33} 34^{10-26}), in which the author (or compiler) adopts a parenetic tone, and where his style displays what may be termed an approximation to the style of Dt.; and these sections appear to have been the

Digitized by Google

source from which the author of Dt. adopted some of the expressions currently used by him.*

In the following list of the most noticeable words or phrases characteristic of Dt., the first 16 may have been suggested to the author by these sections of JE; † those which follow are original in Dt., or occur so rarely in JE, that there is no ground for supposing them to have been borrowed thence. The occurrences in the Deuteronomic sections of *Joshua* are also noted (for the purpose of illustrating their affinity with Dt.); as well as, where necessary, those in other parts of the OT. (especially those written under the influence of Dt.).

1. אהב *to love*:—(*a*) with God as obj.; 6^{5} 7^{9} 10^{12} $11^{1.\,13.\,22}$ $13^{4\,(3)}$ 19^{9} $30^{6.\,16.\,20}$ Jos. 22^{5} 23^{11}. So Ex. 20^{6} (= Dt. 5^{10}). Also Jud. 5^{31} (Deborah); 1 K. 3^{3} (Deut.), of Solomon; Ne. 1^{5} Dan. 9^{4} (both from Dt. 7^{9}); Ps. 31^{24} 97^{10} 145^{20}.

(*b*) Of God's love to His people: 4^{37} 10^{15} (the patriarchs), 10^{18} (the גר), $7^{8.\,13}$ $23^{6\,(5)}$. Not so elsewhere in the Hex. Otherwise first in Hos. (3^{1} 9^{15} $11^{1.\,4}$ $14^{5\,(4)}$), in whose theology it is a fundamental and (apparently) original element (cf. the note on 7^{8}). Also 1 K. 10^{9}, once in Jer. (31^{3}), and in later writers. Cf. the syn. חשק in the same connexion, Dt. 7^{7} 10^{15} (otherwise 21^{11}); and חבב 33^{3}.

2. אלהים אחרים *other gods*: 6^{14} 7^{4} 8^{19} $11^{16.\,28}$ $13^{3.\,7.\,14\,(2.\,6.\,13)}$ 17^{3} 18^{20} $28^{14.\,36.\,64}$ $29^{25\,(26)}$ 30^{17} (always, except 18^{20}, with either *serve*, or *go after*); $31^{18.\,20}$ (not D; see p. 337) with *turn to* (פנה אל); Jos. 23^{16}. So Ex. 20^{3} (= Dt. 5^{7}), 23^{13}; cf. 34^{14} (אל אחר). Otherwise first in E (Jos. $24^{2.\,16}$, and perh. Jud. 10^{13} 1 S. 8^{8}‡), 1 S. 26^{19} 2 K. 5^{17}, and (with פנה אל) Hos. 3^{1}. Very frequent in Jer. and compilers of Jud. Kings (but not usually with the same verbs as in Dt. itself): Jud. $2^{12.\,17.\,19}$ 1 K. $9^{6.\,9}$ (= 2 Ch. $7^{19.\,22}$), $11^{4.\,10}$ 14^{9} 2 K. $17^{7.\,35.\,37.\,38}$ 22^{17} (= 2 Ch. 34^{25}), Jer. 1^{16} $7^{6.\,9.\,18}$ 11^{10} 13^{10} $16^{11.\,13}$ $19^{4.\,13}$ 22^{9} 25^{6} 32^{29} 35^{15} $44^{3.\,5.\,8.\,15}$ 2 Ch. 28^{25}†.

3. האריך *to be long*, or *to prolong*, of days (the Deut. promise upon obedience; cf. p. xxxiii):—(*a*) *to be long* 5^{16} (= Ex. 20^{12}), 6^{2} 25^{15}; (*b*) *to prolong* $4^{26.\,40}$ $5^{30\,(33)}$ 11^{9} 17^{20} 22^{7} 30^{18} 32^{47}. Elsewhere, only (*b*) 1 K. 3^{14} (Deut.) Is. 53^{10} Pr. 28^{16} Eccl. 8^{13}; and differently (האריך ימים אחרי) Jos. 24^{31} = Jud. 2^{7}.

4. *Which Jehovah thy* (*our*, &c.) *God is giving thee* (*us*, &c.), attached

---

* Some of the expressions in Ex. 20^{2-17} are, however, so strikingly Deuteronomic as to suggest another explanation, viz. that the text of the Decalogue was originally briefer than it now is, and that it has been amplified with explanatory additions by an author dependent upon Dt., and using the Deuteronomic style. Comp. p. lxxxvi, *note*.

† On Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, comp., however, the last note.

‡ *L.O.T.* pp. 156 f., 167 f.

Digitized by Google

mostly to *the land* (הארץ), sometimes to *the ground* (האדמה), *the gates*, *the cities*, &c.: $1^{20.25}$ 2^{29} 3^{20} $4^{1.40}$ $11^{17.31}$ 12^{9} $13^{13\,(12)}$ 15^{7} $16^{5.18.20}$ $17^{2.14}$ 18^{9} 25^{15} 26^{2} $27^{2.3}$ 28^{8}. So Ex. 20^{12} (=Dt. 5^{16}); cf. Jos. $1^{2.11.15}$. With the addition of *as an inheritance* 4^{21} 19^{10} 20^{16} 21^{23} 24^{4} 26^{1}; of *to possess it* $5^{28\,(31)}$ $19^{2.14}$ 21^{1}; of *as an inheritance to possess it* 15^{4} 25^{19}.

5. בית עבדים *house of bondage* (lit. *of slaves*): 6^{12} 7^{8} 8^{14} $13^{6.11\,(5.10)}$ Jos. 24^{17} (E). So Jud. 6^{8} (prob. E*) Mic. 6^{4} Jer. 34^{13}. From Ex. $13^{3.14}$ 20^{2} (=Dt. 5^{6})†.

6. *Thy* (*your*) *gates* (of the cities of Israel): $12^{12.15.17.18.21}$ $14^{21.27.28.29}$ $15^{7.22}$ $16^{5.11.14.18}$ $17^{2.8}$ 18^{6} $23^{17\,(16)}$ 24^{14} 26^{12} $28^{52.55.57}$ 31^{12}. So Ex. 20^{10} (=Dt. 5^{14}). Hence 1 K. 8^{37} (Deut.)=2 Ch. 6^{28}†. Cf. (perhaps) Jer. 14^{2}.

7*a*. עם סגלה *a people of special possession*: 7^{6} 14^{2} 26^{18}†. Cf. Ex. 19^{5} והייתם לי סגלה.

7*b*. עם קדוש *a holy people*: 7^{6} $14^{2.21}$ 26^{19} 28^{9}†. Varied from Ex. 19^{16} *a holy nation* (cf. 22^{30}).

8. The *covenant* (ברית), either with the patriarchs, or with Israel (expressing a fundamental theological idea of Dt.: see on 4^{13}): $4^{13.23.31}$ $5^{2.3}$ $7^{2.9.12}$ 8^{18} $9^{9.11.15}$ 10^{8} 17^{2} 28^{69} (29^{1}) $29^{8.11.13.20.24\,(9.12.14.21.25)}$ $31^{9.25.26}$; also 33^{9} (with Levi). Cf. in JE Ex. 19^{5} $24^{7.8}$ $34^{10.27.28}$; also Dt. $31^{16.20}$ (p. 337).

9. *Which I am commanding thee this day*: 4^{40} 6^{6} 7^{11} $8^{1.11}$ 10^{13} 11^{8} $13^{19\,(18)}$ 15^{5} 19^{9} 27^{10} $28^{1.13.15}$ $30^{2.8.11.16}$ (and without *to-day* 6^{2} $12^{14.28}$). So Ex. 34^{11}. With *you* for *thee* $11^{13.27.28}$ $27^{1.4}$ 28^{14}; and without *to-day* $4^{2.2}$ 11^{22} 12^{11} 13^{1} (12^{32}).

10. הוריש *to cause* (others) *to possess*, i.e. *to dispossess* (Jehovah the Canaanites from before Israel): 4^{38} $9^{4.5}$ 11^{23} 18^{12} Jos. 3^{10} 13^{6} $23^{5.9.13}$ Jud. $2^{21.23}$ $11^{23.24}$ 1 K. 14^{24} 21^{26} 2 K. 16^{3} 17^{8} 21^{2} (mostly, if not all, Deut.). So Ex. 34^{24} Nu. 32^{21}. Hence Ps. $44^{3\,(2)}$.

11. השמר לך (השמרו לכם) *take heed to thyself* (*yourselves*), *lest* &c.: 4^{23} 6^{12} 8^{11} 11^{16} $12^{13.19.30}$ 15^{9}; sq. ושמר נפשך מאד, 4^{9}: cf. ונשמרתם מאד 2^{4} 4^{15} Jos. 23^{11}. So Ex. 34^{12}. (Also Gn. 24^{6} 31^{24}, and absolutely Ex. 10^{28}, but without any special force.)

12. *A mighty hand and a stretched out arm*: 4^{34} 5^{15} 7^{19} 11^{2} 26^{8}; hence Jer. 21^{5} (in inverted order), 32^{21} (אזרוע), 1 K. 8^{42} (=2 Ch. 6^{32}), Ez. $20^{33.34}$ Ps. 136^{12}. The *combination* occurs first in Dt. *Mighty hand* alone Dt. 3^{24} 6^{21} 7^{8} 9^{26} 34^{12} (cf. Jos. 4^{24}). So Ex. 3^{19} 6^{1} 13^{19} (cf. חֹזֶק יָד *might of hand* v.$^{3.14.16}$), 32^{11}; and (of Edom) Nu. 20^{20}. Hence Neh. 1^{10} Dan. 9^{15}. *Stretched out arm* alone Dt. 9^{29}. So Ex. 6^{6} (P or H). Hence Jer. 27^{5} 32^{17} 2 K. 17^{36}†.

13. נשבע *to swear*, of Jehovah's oath to the patriarchs: $1^{8.35}$ 4^{31} $6^{10.18.23}$ $7^{8.12.13}$ $8^{1.18}$ 9^{5} 10^{11} $11^{9.21}$ $13^{18\,(17)}$ 19^{8} $26^{3.15}$ 28^{11} $29^{12\,(13)}$ 30^{20} 31^{7} Jos. 1^{6} 5^{6} $21^{41\text{f.}\,(43\text{f.})}$. So in JE, Gn. 50^{24} Ex. $13^{5.11}$ 32^{13} 33^{1} Nu. 11^{12} $14^{16.23}$ 32^{11} Dt. 31^{23} 34^{4}; also Dt. $31^{20.21}$ (p. 337).

14. *To hearken to His* (*Jehovah's*) *voice* (שמע בקולו): 4^{30} (see note) 8^{20} 9^{23} $13^{5.19}$ 15^{5} $26^{14.17}$ 27^{10} $28^{1.2.15.45.62}$ $30^{2.8.10.20}$. So Ex. 15^{26} (ל), 19^{5} $23^{21.22}$ Nu. 14^{22}.

15. *Jehovah*, *thy* (*our*, *your*) *God*, very freq. (esp. with *thy*), altogether more than 300 times ($1^{6.19.20.21}$ &c.). So Ex. 3^{18} 5^{3} $8^{6.22.23}$ $10^{25.26}$ (*our*);

---

* Budde, *ZATW*. 1888, p. 232 (=*Richter u. Sam.* pp. 107 f., 181 *n.*).

Digitized by Google

15^{26} $20^{2.5.7.10.12}$ (=Dt. $5^{6.9.11.14.16}$) 23^{19} $34^{24.26}$ (*thy*); 8^{24} $10^{8.16.17}$ 23^{25} (*your*). Also in other books, though far less frequently than in Dt.: cf. pp. 11, 21. In the formula "I (אני, not אנכי [p. lxxxvii]) am Jehovah your God," occasionally also in P, and frequently in H: viz. Ex. 6^{7} 16^{12} Lev. 11^{44} Nu. 10^{10} $15^{41.41}$, and esp. in Lev. 17–26 (see *L.O.T.* pp. 45, 54, 143).

16. *Jehovah, the God of thy* (*our, your, their*) *fathers*: $1^{11.21}$ 4^{1} 6^{3} 12^{1} 26^{7} 27^{3} $29^{24\,(25)}$. So in E, Ex. $3^{15.16}$ (without *Jehovah*, v.^{6} [*thy father*], ^{13}) 4^{5}.

17. אבה *to be willing*: (sq. inf.) 1^{26} 2^{30} 10^{10} 23^{6} 25^{7} 29^{19}; (sq. לו) 13^{9}.

18. בכל אַוַּת נפשו[ך] *with all the desire of his* (*thy*) *soul*: $12^{15.20.21}$ 18^{6}. So with ל for ב 1 S. 23^{20}; and בְּאַוַּת נ׳ Jer. 2^{24}†.

19. איכה *how?* 1^{12} 7^{17} 12^{30} 18^{21}. Not elsewhere in the Hex.; and rare in other books, איך being generally preferred.

20. *To eat before Jehovah*: $12^{7.18}$ $14^{23.26}$ 15^{20}.

21. התאנף *to be angered*: 1^{37} 4^{21} $9^{8.20}$ 1 K. 11^{9} 2 K. 17^{18} (both Deut.)†.

22. *The land whither thou goest in to possess it*: 4^{5} (*ye*), 7^{1} $11^{10.29}$ $23^{21\,(20)}$ $28^{21.63}$ 30^{16}; cf. (without a rel.) 9^{5} 12^{29}. Similarly *the land whither thou passest* (*ye pass*) *over* (*Jordan*) *to possess it*: $4^{14.26}$ 6^{1} $11^{8.11}$ 30^{18} 31^{13} 32^{47}: cf. (without a rel.) 4^{22} 9^{1} 11^{31} Jos. 1^{11}; also Dt. 3^{21}.

23. בחר *to choose* (with God as subj., in a theocratic sense): of Israel 4^{37} $7^{6.7}$ 10^{15} 14^{2}; of the Levitical priests 18^{5} 21^{5} [1 S. 2^{28}]; of the future king 17^{15}; and esp. in the phrase "the place which Jehovah shall choose to place (*or* set) His name there," $12^{5.11.21}$ $14^{23.24}$ $16^{2.6.11}$ 26^{2}, or "the place which Jehovah shall choose" $12^{14.18.26}$ 14^{25} 15^{20} $16^{7.15.16}$ $17^{8.10}$ 18^{6} 31^{11} Jos. 9^{27}; the latter phrase, also, with a *human* subj., $23^{17\,(16)}$. Very characteristic of Dt.: not applied before to God's choice of Israel; often used by the Deut. compiler of Kings, of Jerusalem, 1 K. $11^{13.32.36}$ $8^{44.48}$ (cf. v.^{16}), 14^{21} 2 K. 21^{7} 23^{27}; in Jer. once, 33^{24}, of Israel. Also charact. of II Isaiah ($41^{8.9}$ 43^{10} $44^{1.2}$; cf. *my chosen one*, also of Israel, 43^{20} 45^{4}. Of God's again favouring Israel by restoring it to Palestine, Is. 14^{1}; *my chosen ones*, of the true Israelites of the future, $65^{9.15.22}$. And applied to Jehovah's ideal servant, the individualized nation, 42^{1} 49^{7}). Twice in P (of the priests, to the *exclusion* of the common Levites), Nu. $16^{5.7}$.

24. ובערת הרע מקרבך (מישראל) *so thou shalt exterminate the evil from thy midst* (*from Israel*), at the end of the description of a judicial procedure: $13^{6\,(5)}$ $17^{7.12}$ 19^{19} 21^{21} $22^{21.22.24}$ 24^{7}. This phrase is peculiar to Dt.; but "and we will exterminate evil (רעה) from Israel" occurs Jud. 20^{13}. בִּעֵר *to exterminate* occurs also Dt. 19^{13} 21^{9} $26^{13.14}$; 2 S. 4^{11} 1 K. 14^{10} 22^{47} 2 K. 23^{24} 2 Ch. 19^{3}; and in the pregn. constr. בער אחרי 1 K. 14^{10} 16^{3} (מבעיר) 21^{21}.

25. *In order that Jehovah may bless thee*: 14^{29} $23^{21\,(20)}$ 24^{19}; with *because, since*, &c. 12^{7} 14^{24} $15^{4.6.10.14}$ $16^{10.15}$; for the emph. laid on Jehovah's *blessing*, comp. also 1^{11} 2^{7} (see note), 7^{13} 15^{18} $28^{8.12}$ 30^{16}; cf. 26^{15}. Cf. in JE, Ex. 20^{24} 23^{25}.

26. גֹּדֶל *greatness* (of God): 3^{24} 5^{21} 9^{26} 11^{2}. So elsewhere only 32^{3} Ps. 150^{2}.

27. *The stranger, the fatherless, and the widow* (הגר והיתום והאלמנה), as types of the needy and unprotected: 10^{18} $24^{17.19.20.21}$ 27^{19}; and, with the *Levite*, 14^{29} $16^{11.14}$ $26^{12.13}$. Cf. Ex. $22^{20f.\,(21f.)}$ (in two different sentences). Hence Jer. 7^{6} 22^{3} Ez. 22^{7}.

28. דבק ב *to cleave to*, of devotion to God: 10^{20} 11^{22} $13^{5\,(4)}$ 30^{20} Jos. 22^{5}

Digitized by Google

23^{8}; the corresponding adj. 4^{4}. So 2 K. 18^{6} (of Ḥezeḳiah); of devotion to false gods 1 K. 11^{2}, to sin 2 K. 3^{3} (all Deut.). Not elsewhere in this application.

29. כאשר דבר יהוה *as Jehovah hath spoken* (i.e. *promised*): 6^{19} 26^{19} 31^{3}; + *to me, thee*, &c. (לך, לכם: not אליכם, אלי): $1^{11.21}$ 6^{3} 9^{3}; 10^{9} (of Levi: so 18^{2}; cf. in D² Jos. $13^{14.33}$); 11^{25} 12^{20} 15^{6} 26^{18} 27^{3} $29^{12\,(13)}$. Cf. Jos. $14^{10.12}$ 22^{4} $23^{5.10}$; Jud. 2^{15} 1 K. $5^{26\,(12)}$ $8^{20.56}$ (all Deut.). Comp. above, p. xvi.

30. *Thy corn, and thy new wine, and thine oil*: 7^{13} 11^{14} 12^{17} 14^{23} 18^{4} 28^{51}.

31. *To walk in Jehovah's ways*: 8^{6} 10^{12} 11^{22} 19^{9} 26^{17} 28^{9} 30^{16} Jos. 22^{5}; so Jud. 2^{22} 1 K. 2^{3} 3^{14} 8^{58} $11^{33.38}$ (all Deut.). Cf. $5^{30\,(33)}$ Ex. 18^{20} (E).

32. *Who shall be in those days*: 17^{9} 19^{17} 26^{3} Jos. 20^{6}†.

33. *And remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt*: 5^{15} 15^{15} 16^{12} $24^{18.22}$.

34. לא תחוס עינך על *thine eye shall not pity him* (*them*): 7^{16} $13^{9\,(8)}$ $19^{13.21}$ 25^{12}. The same idiom Gn. 45^{20} Is. 13^{18}; and frequently in Ez. (5^{11} $7^{4.9}$ *al.*).

35. חזק ואמץ (חזקו ואמצו) *be* (*ye*) *courageous and strong*: $31^{6.7.23}$ Jos. $1^{6.7.9.18}$ 10^{25}; cf. Dt. 3^{28} חזקהו ואמצהו. The expression may seem to be an ordinary one; but it occurs besides only 1 Ch. 22^{13} 28^{20} 2 Ch. 32^{7} (reminiscences from Dt.: notice the following אל תירא ואל תחת, comp. with Dt. 1^{21} 31^{8}, and in D² Jos. 1^{9} 8^{1} 10^{25}).

36. והיה בך חטא *and it be sin in thee*: 15^{9} $23^{22\,(21)}$ 24^{15}, cf. 21^{22}: with *not*, $23^{23\,(22)}$†. In H and P the phrase used is *to bear sin*, Lev. 19^{17} 22^{9} Nu. $18^{22.32}$.

37. *Statutes and judgments* (חקים ומשפטים): $4^{1.5.8.14}$ 5^{1} 11^{32} 12^{1} 26^{16} 1 K. 9^{4} 2 K. 17^{37}; +*commandment(s)* $5^{28\,(31)}$ 6^{1} 7^{11} 26^{17} 1 K. 8^{58}; +*testimonies* 4^{45} 6^{20}; cf. *commandments and statutes* 6^{17} (+*testimonies*), 27^{10} Ex. 15^{26}, in the opp. order 4^{40} 1 K. 3^{14} 8^{61}; *statutes* alone 4^{6} 6^{24} 16^{12}, cf. 17^{19}. And with חקות, *commandments and statutes* 10^{13} $28^{15.45}$ 30^{10} 1 K. 9^{6} 11^{34} 2 K. 17^{13}; *statutes and commandments* 6^{2} 1 K. 11^{38}; +*judgments* 8^{11} 11^{1} 30^{16} 1 K. 2^{3} (+*testimonies*): cf. 1 K. 3^{3} 6^{12} 11^{33} 2 K. 17^{34} 23^{3}. The passages from Kings are all Deuteronomic.

38. הארץ הטובה *the good land*, of Canaan: 1^{35} 3^{25} $4^{21.22}$ 6^{18} 8^{10} (v.^{7} *a good land*), 9^{6} 11^{17} Jos. 23^{16} (v.$^{13.15}$ *a good ground*). So 1 Ch. 28^{8} (a reminiscence). Cf. Ex. 3^{8} (JE) *a good and broad land*; also Nu. 14^{7} (P); Dt. 1^{25}.

39. *Which thou* (*ye*) *knowest* (or *knewest*) *not*: (*a*) of the manna, $8^{3.16}$; (*b*) of strange gods, 11^{28} $13^{3.7.14\,(2.6.13)}$ 28^{64} $29^{25\,(26)}$; (*c*) of a foreign people $28^{33.36}$. (*b*) also 32^{17} (the Song), Jer. 7^{9} 19^{4} 44^{3}; and (*c*) Jer. $9^{15\,(16)}$: in Jer., also, of a land (in the threat of exile), 14^{18} (*RV. m.*, reading לא for ולא), 15^{14} 16^{13} 17^{4} 22^{28}.

40. כיום הזה *as at this day*: 2^{30} $4^{20.38}$ 6^{24} (כהיום הזה), 8^{18} 10^{15} $29^{27\,(28)}$. See the note on 2^{30}, where the other occurrences of the phrase are quoted, and it is shown that it gives expression to a favourite Deuteronomic thought.

41. כל־הימים=*continually* (lit. *all the days*): 4^{40} $5^{26\,(29)}$ 6^{24} 11^{1} 14^{23} 18^{5} 19^{9} $28^{29.33}$ Jos. 4^{24}. Cf. on 4^{40}; and add 1 K. $5^{15\,(1)}$ 8^{40} 9^{3} $11^{36.39}$ 12^{7} 14^{30} 2 K. 8^{19} 13^{3} 17^{37} (nearly all Deut.).

42. למען (אשר) ייטב לך *that it may be well for thee*: 4^{40} $5^{16.26\,(29)}$ $6^{3.18}$ $12^{25.28}$ 22^{7}. Similarly (לכם) וטוב לך $5^{30\,(33)}$ 19^{13}; (לנו) לטוב לך 6^{24} 10^{13}. A characteristic Deuteronomic principle (p. xxxiii).

43. הֵיטֵב *inf. abs.*, used adverbially=*thoroughly*; 9^{21} $13^{15\,(14)}$ 17^{4} 19^{18} 27^{8}. Elsewhere, in this application, only 2 K. 11^{18}†.

Digitized by Google

44. (יוכל) לא תוכל *thou* (*he*) *canst not*, in the sense of *mayest not*: 7^{22} 12^{17} 16^{5} 17^{15} 21^{16} $22^{3.19.29}$ 24^{4}. A very uncommon use: cf. Gn. 43^{32}.

45. The duty of *fearing God* inculcated: $6^{2.13}$ 10^{20} $13^{5(4)}$ 31^{12}; esp. in the inf. ליראה, often with *that they may learn* prefixed, 4^{10} $5^{26(29)}$ 6^{24} 8^{6} 10^{12} 14^{23} 17^{19} 28^{58} 31^{13}.

46. ירש *to possess*, esp. in the inf. לרשת, לרשתה *to possess it*, at the end of a sentence, sometimes even pleonastically: see above Nos. 4, 22, and add 2^{31} 3^{18} 9^{6} 12^{1}. Followed by a *personal* obj. (peoples), see 9^{1} (phil. n.).

47. *All Israel*: 1^{1} (see note), 5^{1} 13^{12} 21^{21} 27^{9} 29^{1} $31^{1.7.11.11}$ 32^{45} 34^{12} Jos. 3^{7} 4^{14} 23^{2} *al.*

48. *To do that which is right* (הישר) *in the eyes of Jehovah*: 12^{25} $13^{19(18)}$ 21^{9}; + והטוב *and that which is good* 6^{18} 12^{28}. So Ex. 15^{26} (JE) Jer. 34^{15}; and in the estimates of the kings (all due to the compiler), 1 K. $11^{33.38}$ 14^{8} $15^{5.11}$ 22^{43} (=2 Ch. 20^{32}), 2 K. 10^{30} $12^{3(2)}$ (=2 Ch. 24^{2}), 14^{3} (=2 Ch. 25^{2}), 15^{3} (=2 Ch. 26^{4}), ^{34} (=2 Ch. 27^{2}), 16^{2} (=2 Ch. 28^{1}), 18^{3} (=2 Ch. 29^{2}), 22^{2} (=2 Ch. 34^{2}).

49. *To do that which is evil* (הרע) *in the eyes of Jehovah*: 4^{25*} 9^{18*} 17^{2} 31^{29*}. So Nu. 32^{13}; often in the Deut. framework of Judges (2^{11} $3^{7.12.12}$ 4^{1} 6^{1} 10^{6} 13^{1}) and Kings (*e.g.* 1 K. 11^{6} 14^{22} 15^{26}); Jer. 7^{30} 18^{10} 32^{30}; and occasionally elsewhere (as 1 S. 15^{19} 2 S. 12^{9} Is. 65^{12} 66^{4}). Both this and No. 48 gained currency through Dt., and are rare, except in passages written under its influence.

50. *The priests the Levites* (*i.e.* the Levitical priests): $17^{9.18}$ 18^{1} 24^{8} 27^{9} Jos. 3^{3} 8^{33}; *the priests the sons of Levi* Dt. 21^{5} 31^{9}. So Jer. 33^{18} Ez. 43^{19} 44^{15} 2 Ch. 5^{5} [prob. also in the ‖ 1 K. 8^{4}], 23^{18} 30^{27}†. P's expression, "sons of Aaron," is never used in Dt. (see pp. 214, 219). Cf. Jer. 33^{21}.

51. *With all thy* (*your*) *heart and with all thy* (*your*) *soul*, i.e. with the devotion of the whole being (cf. p. xxi): 4^{29} 6^{5} 10^{12} 11^{13} $13^{4(3)}$ 26^{16} $30^{2.6.10}$ Jos. 22^{5} 23^{14}. Only besides (in the third person) 1 K. 2^{4} 8^{48} (=2 Ch. 6^{38}) 2 K. 23^{3} (=2 Ch. 34^{31}) ^{25} 2 Ch. 15^{12}; and (in the first person, of God) Jer. 32^{41}†.

52. נתן לפני *to give* (*deliver*) *up before* (of a conquered land or foe): $1^{8.21}$ $2^{31.33.36}$ $7^{2.23}$ $23^{15(14)}$ 31^{5}, and (with נִגַּף *smitten*) $28^{7.25}$. So Jos. 10^{12} 11^{6}. Elsewhere, only Jud. 11^{9} 1 K. 8^{46} (Deut.) Is. 41^{2}. The usual syn. is *give into the hand of*, which also occurs several times in Dt.: see on 3^{2}.

53. *To turn* (סור) *neither to the right hand nor to the left*: 2^{27} *lit.* (altered from Nu. 20^{17}, which has נטה *to incline*): so 1 S. 6^{12} (of the kine). *Metaph.* $5^{29(32)}$ $17^{11.20}$ 28^{14} Jos. 1^{7} 23^{6}; so 2 K. 22^{2} (=2 Ch. 34^{2}).

54. ערץ *to be affrighted*: 1^{29} 7^{21} 20^{3} 31^{6} Jos. 1^{9}. Not elsewhere in prose.

55. מעשה ידים *the work of the hands* (=enterprise): 2^{7} 14^{29} 16^{15} 24^{19} 28^{12} 30^{9}; in a bad sense, 31^{29}. In the neutral sense of *enterprise*, not very common elsewhere, Hag. $2^{14.17}$ Ps. 90^{17} Job 1^{10} Eccl. $5^{5(6)}$; in a bad sense, 1 K. 16^{7} 2 K. 22^{17} (both Deut., and in both + *to vex with*, as Dt. 31^{29}), Jer. $25^{6.7}$ 32^{30} (also + *to vex with*), Ps. 28^{4} La. 3^{64}.

56. פדה *to ransom*, fig. of the deliverance from Egypt: 7^{8} (with *from the house of bondage*, as Mic. 6^{4}), 9^{26} $13^{6(5)}$ 15^{15} 21^{8} 24^{18}. Not so elsewhere

---

* + להכעיסו *to vex him* (viz. by the undeserved dishonour, involved in idolatry), as 1 K. 16^{7} 2 K. 17^{17} 21^{6} (=2 Ch. 33^{6}).

Digitized by Google

in the Hex.: Ex. 15^{13} (the Song of Moses) uses גאל (*to reclaim*: see the note on 7^{8}).

57. . . . על כן אנכי מצוך *therefore I command thee* . . .: $15^{11.\,15}$ 19^{7} $24^{18.\,22}$.

58. קֶרֶב *midst*, in various connexions, esp. *in* or *from thy* (or *Israel's*) *midst*: 1^{42} (Nu. 14^{42}) 4^{5} 6^{15} 7^{21} 11^{6} $13^{2.\,12.\,15\,(1.\,11.\,14)}$ 16^{11} $17^{2.\,20}$ 18^{2} $19^{10.\,20}$ 21^{8} $23^{15.\,17\,(14.\,16)}$ 26^{11} 28^{43} $29^{10.\,15\,(11.\,16)}$; $2^{14.\,15.\,16}$ $4^{3.\,34}$ $13^{6.\,14\,(5.\,13)}$ 15^{11} $17^{7.\,15}$ $18^{15.\,18}$ 19^{19} $21^{9.\,21}$ $22^{21.\,24}$ 24^{7}. The word is a common one, and naturally occurs in JE (as also elsewhere), though with nothing like the same frequency as in Dt. P, with not less frequency, uses the syn. תָּוֶךְ (*e.g.* of Israel, 32^{51} Ex. 25^{8} 29^{45} Nu. 3^{12} $4^{2.\,18}$ &c.), which occurs also in Dt., but only in the phrase noted below, No. 69 (cf. 5^{20}), in the combination אל תוך *into the midst* 13^{17} 21^{12} 22^{2} $23^{11.\,12}$ (as 2 S. 3^{27} *al.*: אל קרב is not generally said, in Gn. 41^{21} קרב denoting specially the *interior* of an animal), and in 3^{16} $5^{20\,(23)}$ 11^{3} 19^{2}.

59. *Which thine eyes have seen* (emph. for the normal *thou hast seen*): 4^{9} 7^{19} 10^{21} $29^{2\,(3)}$ (cf. 21^{7}).

60. *Thy* (*your*) *eyes are those that have seen* (another emph. formula): 3^{21} 4^{3} 11^{7}†.

61. *To eat and be satisfied*: 6^{11} (see note), $8^{10.\,12}$ 11^{15} 14^{29} 26^{12}; also 31^{20} (p. 337).

62. The caution *not to forget*: $4^{9.\,23}$ 6^{12} $8^{11.\,14.\,19}$ 9^{7} 25^{19b}; cf. 26^{13b}.

63. לשכן שמו שם, שכן *to make His name dwell there* (viz. in the central sanctuary): 12^{11} 14^{23} $16^{2.\,6.\,11}$ 26^{2}. Only besides Jer. 7^{12} Ezr. 6^{12} Neh. 1^{9}†. With לשום (*to set*) 12^{5} (see note) ^{21} 14^{24}. This occurs also in Kings,* viz. 1 K. 9^{3} 11^{36} 14^{21} 2 K. $21^{4.\,7}$ (=2 Ch. 33^{7}); also 2 Ch. 6^{20} (varied from 1 K. 8^{29} *shall be*) 12^{13}†.

64. (ידכם) משלח ידך *that to which thou puttest thine* (*ye put your*) *hand* (=enterprise): $12^{7.\,18}$ 15^{10} 23^{21} $28^{8.\,20}$†.

65. השמיד *to destroy*, נשמד *to be destroyed*: 1^{27} $2^{12.\,21.\,22.\,23}$ 4^{3} 6^{15} $7^{4.\,24}$ $9^{3.\,8.\,14.\,19.\,20.\,25}$ $28^{48.\,63}$ $31^{3.\,4}$ Jos. 9^{24} $11^{14.\,20}$ 23^{15}: Dt. 4^{26} 7^{23} 12^{30} $28^{10.\,24.\,45.\,51.\,61}$. The word is not an uncommon one; but it occurs elsewhere in the Hex. only Gn. 34^{30} (J) Jos. 7^{12} (JE) 24^{8} (E); Lev. 26^{30} Nu. 33^{52} (H); and Dt. 33^{27} (the Blessing).

66. שמע ישראל *Hear, O Israel*: 5^{1} 6^{4} 9^{1} 20^{3}; cf. 27^{9}, also 4^{1}.

67. *And . . . shall hear and fear* (of the deterrent effects of punishment); $13^{12\,(11)}$ 17^{13} 19^{20} 21^{21}.

68*a*. שמר לעשות *to observe to do*: $5^{1.\,29\,(32)}$ $6^{3.\,25}$ 8^{1} 11^{32} 12^{1} 13^{1} (12^{32}) 15^{5} 17^{10} 24^{8b} $28^{1.\,15.\,58}$ 31^{12} 32^{46} Jos. $1^{7.\,8}$ 22^{5}: so 2 K. 17^{37} 21^{8} (=2 Ch. 33^{8}; hence also 1 Ch. 22^{13}). Cf. (with accus. intervening) 7^{11} 11^{22} 17^{19} 19^{9}; also $13^{19\,(18)}$.

68*b*. *To observe and do*: 4^{6} 7^{12} 16^{12} $23^{24\,(23)}$ 24^{8a} 26^{16} 28^{13} (cf. $29^{8\,(9)}$) Jos. 23^{6}.

69. מתוך האש *out of the midst of the fire*: $4^{12.\,15.\,33.\,36}$ $5^{4.\,19.\,21.\,23}$ 9^{10} 10^{4}.

70. (*a*) תועבת י׳ *Jehovah's abomination*, esp. as the final ground of a prohibition: 7^{25} 12^{31} 17^{1} 18^{12a} 22^{5} 23^{18} 25^{16} 27^{15}; cf. 24^{4}: (*b*) תועבה alone, chiefly of heathen or idolatrous customs, 7^{26} (an idol, or idolatrous relic) 13^{15} 14^{3} (forbidden kinds of food), 17^{4}; of customs of the Canaanites, $18^{9.\,12b}$ 20^{18} (cf. 1 K. 14^{24} 2 K. 16^{3} $21^{2.\,11}$). So 32^{16}; and often in Jer., and (esp.) Ez.

---

* Together with להיות *to be*, יהיה *shall be*, which are not in Dt.: viz. 1 K. 8^{16} (=2 Ch. 6^{5}) ^{29} 2 K. 23^{27}: so 2 Ch. 6^{6} 33^{4} (varied from 1 K. 9^{3} 2 K. 21^{4} *set*); cf. 20^{9}.

Digitized by Google

a is an expression that occurs often in the Proverbs (as $11^{1.20}$ 12^{22} $15^{8.9.26}$): with *b* comp. in H Lev. $18^{22.26.27.29.30}$ 20^{13} (but *only* of sins of unchastity).—Cf. p. lxxi f. Other expressions, recurring less frequently, are noted in the Commentary.

The following is a list of noticeable words or expressions found *only* in Dt. (c. 32. 33 excluded; see pp. 348, 389):—

אָזֶן 23^{14}; האמיר $26^{17.18}$; מבושים 25^{11}; מגערת 28^{20}; ראבון 28^{65}; מדוה 7^{15} 28^{60}; (נחשלים) חשל 28^{27}; חרם 28^{22}; חַרְחֻר 23^{26} 16^{9}; חרמש 28^{38}; חָסַל 1^{41}; הֵהִין 28^{22}; דלקת 25^{18}; טנא *basket* $26^{2.4}$ $28^{5.17}$; קָלָה 28^{32}; לֵחַ 34^{7}; מלילה 23^{26}; סְפַּת 16^{10}; עד כתים 2^{24} 3^{6} (but read so in Jud. 20^{48} as well); נשל (=Arab. *nasala*) 19^{5} 28^{40} (see on 7^{1}); מסכנות 8^{9}; סכת (חִסְכַּת) 27^{9}; עבט, העביט $15^{6.8}$ 24^{10}; עבוט 24^{10-13} (cf. עַבְטִיט Hab. 2^{6}); עלילות דברים $22^{14.17}$; התעמר 21^{14} 24^{7}; העניק 15^{14} (cf. עֲנָק Ps. 73^{6}); מעקה 22^{8}; עשתרות צאנך 7^{13} $28^{4.18.51}$; עֶרְוַת דבר 23^{15} 24^{1}; פֵּאֵר 24^{20} (denom. from פֹּארָה); צלצל 28^{42} (as name of insect); קשי 9^{27}; רַגָּז 28^{65}; שגר אלפיך 7^{13} $28^{4.18.51}$ [שגר בהמה Ex. 13^{12}†]; שליה 28^{57}; שְׁמִטָּה *release* $15^{1.2.9}$ 31^{10}; שִׁנַּן 6^{7}; also אקו, דישן, זמר, and ראה (but read דאה, as Lev. 11^{14}), $14^{5.13}$.

The following is a list of *unusual* words or expressions, occurring in Dt. (creatures named in c. 14 excluded; also c. 32. 33); fuller particulars respecting most of them will be found in the notes:—

חדש האביב *the month of Abib* 16^{1}; אסם 28^{8} Pr. 3^{10}†; אשדות *slopes* (of Pisgah) 3^{17} 4^{49}; בֵּאֵר 1^{5} 27^{8} Hab. 2^{2}†; בָּצֵק 8^{4} (cited Neh. 9^{21})†; גדלים 22^{12}; גור 1^{17} 18^{22} (cf. 32^{27}), and יָגֹר 9^{19} 28^{60}, *to be in dread* (sq. מפני); גרב 28^{27}; בבלי דעת 4^{42} 19^{4} Jos. $20^{3.5}$; הדף 6^{19} 9^{4} Jos. 23^{5}; הֵזִיד 1^{43} 17^{13} 18^{20}; זָכוּר 16^{16} 20^{13}; זִנֵּב 25^{18} Jos. 10^{19}†; חלה 29^{21}; חשק ב׳ 7^{7} 10^{15} 21^{11}; טוטפות 6^{8} 11^{18} Ex. 13^{16}†; יְקוּם 11^{6}; מורא גדול (מוראים גדלים) 4^{34} 26^{8} 34^{12} (Jer. 32^{21}); נושן 4^{25}; כור הברזל 4^{20}; כלאים 22^{9} Lev. 19^{19}†; כליון 28^{65}; קָאֹר (as *subst.*) 6^{5} 2 K. 23^{25}†; מארה 28^{20}; מסוה 23^{3}; משארת $28^{5.17}$; נדח *to impel* (of an axe, or hand wielding one) 19^{5} 20^{19}; of being driven into idolatry 4^{19} 30^{17}; so הִדִּיחַ $13^{6.11.14}$ 2 K. 17^{21} Qrê, 2 Ch. 21^{11} (not elsewhere in this sense); הכיר פנים 1^{17} 16^{19}; נסח 28^{63}; נשל (=Arab. *nashala*) $7^{1.22}$; פסל 4^{16}; סרה *defection* 13^{6} 19^{16}; עורון 28^{28}; הציף 11^{4}; קדחת 28^{22}; קטף 23^{26} (Job, Ez.); רנן 1^{27}; שחפת 28^{22}; שעטנז 22^{11} Lev. 19^{19}†; תמהון 28^{28}; עד תמם 2^{15} $31^{24.30}$.

The following expressions, occurring mostly once only in Dt., are more or less frequent in subsequent writers, esp. those of the Deuteronomic school (see notes):—

שקוצים and גלולים $29^{16(17)}$; ועוה 28^{65}; הכעים *to vex* (esp. by idolatry) 4^{25} 9^{18} 31^{29} 32^{16} (cf. כַּעַס v.[21]); הִדִּיחַ *to expel* (from Canaan) 30^{1}, cf. v.[4]; *the name to be called over* 28^{10}; רע מעלליך 28^{20}; שמה, שנינה 28^{37}; שרירות $29^{18(19)}$; נתש 29^{27}.

The general literary style of Dt. is singularly pure and beautiful; with the fewest possible exceptions,* the diction is

* Comp. on 1^{22} 3^{14} 11^{6} 12^{5} 24^{5}.

Digitized by Google

classical, and the syntax idiomatic and regular. Dt. abounds, for instance, with classical examples for the construction, in different connexions, of the perfect with *Waw* consecutive.

The parenetic tone of Dt. bears a superficial resemblance to that of H (*e.g.* Lev. 26); but when the two styles are compared more closely, numerous differences at once reveal themselves, that of Dt. presenting affinities with *Jeremiah*, while H displays affinities with *Ezekiel*. The only noticeable point of contact in the style of Dt. with that of H is the use of the term *thy brother* (see the passages quoted in the note on 15^{2}). With P, Dt. shows no phraseological resemblance whatever. In the laws touching common ground (whether with H or P) identical terms occur (as c. 14 מין; 22^{9} כלאים; 22^{11} שעטנז; 24^{8} נגע הצרעת); but these either (as those in c. 14) form part of a quotation, or are technical expressions (cf. p. xii); they are not *recurrent* in Dt., and do not therefore constitute any real phraseological similarity between the two writings.

The majority of the expressions noted above (p. lxxviii ff.) occur seldom or never besides; others occur only in passages modelled upon the style of Dt., and representing the same point of view. Of course a tabulated list of idioms cannot adequately characterize the style of an author; there is an effect produced by the manner in which phrases are combined, and by the structure and rhythm of sentences, which defies tabulation, or even description, and which can only be properly appreciated by repeated perusal of the work in question. Those who have by this course familiarized themselves with the style of the Deuteronomic discourses, will be conscious how greatly it differs from that of any other part of the Pent.,—even the parenetic sections of JE (p. lxxvii), which show a tendency to approach it, not exhibiting the *complete* Deuteronomic rhythm or expression.* The style of Dt. could not

* Thus in Gn. 26^{5} the rhythm is not that of Dt., nor the plural תורות. In Ex. 15^{26} D would say בקול for לקול, and would not use אני, and hardly האזין (1^{45}); nor would מצותיו and חקיו be distributed into *two* clauses. By some scholars (*e.g.* Bacon, *Triple Tradition*), large parts of these sections, as also various other passages in Ex. Nu. (as Ex. 3^{15} 9^{19-21} 10^{1b-2} 12^{21-27} $22^{20b-23.\ 26\ (21b-24.\ 27)}$ $23^{9.\ 11b.\ 12b}$ 32^{13}), are thought to be additions due to a Deuteronomic hand. It is true, they are largely didactic in tone, and

Digitized by Google

have been formed without precedents; and it is probable that these parts of JE (and perhaps other writings not now extant, the style of which was similar) formed the basis upon which the Deuteronomist developed his own literary style, and supplied elements which, in moulding it, he assimilated. Another of his literary models may have been the hortatory, or prophetic, sections of E, or (in Judges and Sam.) of a document (or documents) allied to E.* It is evident, however, that the original features of his style preponderate decidedly above those that are derived. The strong individuality of the author colours everything that he writes; and even a sentence, borrowed from elsewhere, assumes by the new setting in which it is placed a fresh character, and impresses the reader differently.

This may often be observed in the retrospects, c. 1–3. 9^{7}–10^{11}. Notice, for instance, the fine effect of לָרֹב in 1^{10} 10^{22} 28^{62}, and how by its addition כּוכבי השמים of Gn. 22^{17} is adapted to the oratorical style of Dt. The variations in 1^{33}, as compared with Ex. 13^{21}, have a similar effect (observe esp. the sustained rhythm, produced by connecting v.[33] with v.[32] by ההולך). In 1^{42} notice the force of the addition of ולא תלחמו (as in 9^{26} of ונחלתך and אשר פדית בגדלך), and in 1^{44} of וירדפו אתכם כאשר תעשינה הדברים; in 2^{28} (אכל בכסף תשבירני ואכלתי ומים בכסף תתן לי ושתיתי רק אעברה ברגלי) the superior rhythm to Nu. 20^{19} (במסלה נעלה ואם מימיך נשתה אני ומקני ונתתי מכרם רק אין דבר ברגלי אעברה). Nu. 13^{28} אפס כי עז העם הישב בארץ והערים בצרות גדולות מאד is ordinary prose; Dt. 1^{28} עם גדול ורם ממנו ערים גדולות ובצורת בשמים is oratory. Comp. similarly Nu. $14^{23-24. 31. 40b}$ with Dt. $1^{35-36. 39. 41}$ (in v.[36] notice דרך בה for בא שמה).

In Deuteronomy, a new style of flowing and impressive

have, as Wellh. recognized (*Comp.* pp. 76, 81, 88, 97 *n.*, 208), points of contact with Dt.; but the later Deuteronomic writers usually display the Deut. phraseology as decidedly as Dt. itself, if not more so; and the fact that in these passages of JE it is *less* marked than in Dt. is a reason for referring them—except perhaps parts of Ex. 20^{2-17} (p. lxxviii *n.*)—to a *pre*-Deuteronomic hand (either J, or the compiler of JE: comp. *L.O.T.* p. 116). Cf. Kuen. *Hex.* §§ 9 *n.* 2, 4; 13 *n.* 21, 29, 31, 32 (5), who takes an intermediate view.

* Compare the *pre*-Deuteronomic parts of Jos. 24^{1-26} (*L.O.T.* p. 106), of Jud. 6^{7-10} 10^{6-16} (*ib.* pp. 156, 158); 1 S. 2^{17-36}, parts of 1 S. 7–8 10^{17-27a} 12 (*ib.* p. 167 f.; and below, p. 213), 2 S. 7. All these passages show *some* affinity in thought and expression to Dt.; and all (except 1 S. 2^{17-36},—which ought probably to be included,—and a few isolated phrases in the other passages) are characterized rightly by Budde (*Richter u. Samuel*, 1890, pp. 108, 128, 180 ff. 244 f.; and in *The Books of Samuel*, in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*) as pre-Deuteronomic.

Digitized by Google

oratory was introduced into Hebrew literature, by means of which the author strove to move and influence his readers. Hence (quite apart from the matter of his discourse) he differs from the most classical writers of historical narrative, by developing his thought into long and rolling periods, which have the effect of bearing the reader with them, and holding him enthralled by their oratorical power. The beauty and effectiveness of Dt. are indeed chiefly due to the skill with which the author amplifies his thoughts, and casts them into well-balanced clauses, varied individually in expression and form,* but all bound together by a sustained rhythmical flow.† The author's fondness for the pathetic reflexive dative ‡ may mark his sympathy with the people whom he is addressing; but his love of *asyndeta*,§ and of the emphatic form ןּ- in the 2nd and 3rd persons plural of the impf., as also his preference for לֵבָב (47 times) above לֵב,|| and for אָנֹכִי (56 times) above אֲנִי,¶ are probably due to his sense of what harmonized best with the oratorical rhythm of his discourse. It is another characteristic of the elevated prose of Dt., that it not unfrequently uses rare or choice words, not found in ordinary prose.** The rhetorical breadth and fulness of the Deuteronomic style, and the copiousness of its diction, are manifest even in a translation. The practical aims of the author, and the parenetic treatment, which as a rule his subject demands, oblige him

* Notice, as one mode of expansion, which adds a measured dignity to the Deuteronomic style, the clauses attached ἀσυνδέτως, $4^{26b. 36}$ (after v.^{35}), $5^{30 (33)}$ (after v.$^{29 (32)}$), $7^{2b. 3b. 10b. 22b. 24b. 26b}$ 9^{7b} $11^{11b. 12b}$ 15^{19b} 17^{15b} $28^{7b. 24b}$.

† *E.g.* $4^{15-19. 32-36}$ 6^{10-15} 7^{17-19} 8^{11-17} $11^{2-7. 10-12}$ $12^{5-7. 10-12}$ 13^{7-12} $28^{20ff.}$. Comp. the series of clauses introduced ἀσυνδέτως by תבנית 4^{16b-18}, by ארץ 8^{7b-9}, by גוי 28^{49b-50}; also $4^{7-8. 32b-34}$ 8^{14b-16} $28^{30-33. 38-42}$.

‡ See the phil. notes on $1^{7. 13}$. § Cf. on 17^{8} 18^{1}.

|| Which occurs only 4^{11} (see p. lxxi *n.*), 28^{65} $29^{3. 18}$.

¶ Only 12^{30} 29^{5} (for the reason of these exceptions, see the notes). The other occurrences of אני in Dt.—$32^{21. 39. 39. 39. 39}$ in the Song, and $32^{49. 52}$ in P—are not from the pen of the author of the discourses.

** *E.g.* נגר 1^{17} 18^{22}; חתת in the phrase אל תירא ואל תחת (1^{21} 31^{8}: hence in D^{2} Jos. 1^{9} 8^{1} 10^{25}, and as a reminiscence 1 Ch. 22^{13} 28^{20} 2 Ch. $20^{15. 17}$ 32^{7}: otherwise only 1 S. 17^{11}, and in the prophets); ערץ (p. lxxxii); דָּרַךְ (1^{36} $11^{24. 25}$; cf. Jos. 1^{3} 14^{9}: in a *purely* literal sense, 1 S. 5^{5} Jud. 9^{27}: otherwise poet.); התאנף (p. lxxx); האזין (1^{45}); אף (2^{11}: see note); חול *be in anguish* (2^{25}: 1 S. 31^{3} *lit.*); שגב *be lofty* (2^{36}); התעבר (3^{26}); הרדיה (8^{9}); ירבְּיֻן (8^{13}); נֹר (9^{19} 28^{60}); וסם (19^{19}); ראה (28^{49}); שוש (28^{63} 30^{9}); הרגיע (28^{65}).

Digitized by Google

naturally to expand and reiterate more than is usually the case with Hebrew writers; nevertheless, his discourse, while never (in the bad sense of the term) rhetorical, always maintains its freshness, and is never monotonous or prolix. The oratory of the prophets is frequently more ornate and diversified: in his command of a chaste, yet warm and persuasive eloquence, the author of Deuteronomy stands unique among the writers of the Old Testament.

The linguistic character of Dt. is entirely consistent with the date assigned to it by critics (cf. p. xlvii, No. 6): on the one hand, it contains nothing rugged, or otherwise suggestive of antiquity; on the other hand, it exhibits none of those marks of a deteriorated style which begin to show themselves in Hebrew shortly afterwards. In its broader literary features Dt. resembles closely the *prose* parts of Jeremiah (p. xcii f.).

There are no "archaisms," either in Dt., or in the Pentateuch generally, of a character to establish its antiquity. (1) The epicene הוא is not an archaism: for the fact that Arab. Eth. Aram.—to say nothing of Assyrian—all have a fem. with *yod*, is proof that the distinction between the two genders must have existed already in the original language spoken by the Semitic nations, when they lived together in a common home, and that Hebrew consequently, even in its earliest stage, must have possessed a fem. *hi'*.* In Phoen. Moab. and old Aramaic Inscriptions the pron. of the 3rd pers. sing. is written regularly הא,† which, as the evidence of the cognate languages just referred to shows, will have been pronounced *hu'* or *hi'*, as the sense required. 𝔊 shows that in the older Heb. MSS. the *scriptio plena* was not generally introduced; and in the light of the facts just adduced, it may be safely inferred that the ו of הוא in the Pent., and the ו and י of הוא and היא in other parts of the OT. (except possibly in the very latest), formed no part of the original autographs. The epicene הוא will thus not have been introduced into the Pent. until a comparatively late epoch in the transmission of the text—perhaps in connexion with the assumption, which is partly borne out by facts (Del. *ZKWL.* 1880, p. 396 f.), that in the older language fem. forms were used more

---

* Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* 1866, p. 458 f., 1878, p. 594; Delitzsch, *ZKWL.* 1880, p. 395 f., and *Comm. on Gen.* (Engl. tr.) i. 42 f., 50; Wright, *Compar. Gramm.* pp. 103–105.

† As *CIS.* I. i. 1^{9} מלך צדק הא, 1^{13} מלאכת הא, 3^{22} הממלכת הא, and frequently; in Mesha's Inscription, line 6 ויאמר גם הא, line 27 הא [*i.e.* חָרֻם] כי הרס; and in the recently discovered Aramaic (Nöld. *ZDMG.* 1893, p. 99) inscriptions of Zinjirli, near Antioch in Syria (8 cent. B.C.), as Panammu, line 11 בעל כסף הא (D. H. Müller, *Die altsem. Inschriften von Sendschirli*, 1893, pp. 6, 18, 44). Comp. *Notes on Samuel*, p. xxxiii.

Digitized by Google

sparingly than subsequently. The peculiarity is not, in fact, confined to the Pent. It is found in the MS. of the "Later Prophets," exhibiting the Oriental text, and superlinear punctuation, now at St. Petersburg, and dated A.D. 916: see the passages cited on Ez. 30[18] in the *Adnotationes Criticæ* prefixed to Strack's facsimile edition.

(2) On הָאֵל for הָאֵלֶּה (3 times in Dt., 8 in the Pent., and אֵל 1 Ch. 20[8]) see the note on 4[42]. Dr. Sinker, in his note on this form (*Lex Mosaica*, p. 472), omits to mention—what surely is an element in judging of these 8 *exceptional* passages—that the *usual* forms in the Pent. (some 260 times) are האלה and אלה, exactly as in other books.

(3) On the epicene נער (*young person*,—the sex being indicated by the context), see on 22[15] (p. 255); comp. Kuen. *Hex.* pp. 318 f., 321 f., 342, G.-K. § 2. 5 (who are inclined to regard the distinction as merely orthographical: see, however, König, *Einl.* p. 152 f.). No doubt, this is the older usage; but we possess no independent knowledge how long it continued, or when the distinctive form for the fem. came into use; and it is unreasonable to allow a single phenomenon, of which the explanation is doubtful, to outweigh the evidence of a multitude of indications pointing convergently in an opposite direction. Hence until the supposition made on p. 225 can be shown to be an improbable one, the epicene נער cannot be used in proof of the antiquity of the Pentateuch. Both this distinction and No. 1 imply that, when they arose, the Pent. had been *formally* separated from Joshua (in spite of the fact that the same documents are continued in it) and the following historical books, and stood (in some respects) upon a different footing from them; but nothing obliges us to suppose that this separation was effected until considerably after the return of the Jews from Babylon.

(4) On the term. ון-, in the 2nd and 3rd pers. pl. of the impf. (56 times), see the note on 1[17] (p. 19); and on the same form—very anomalously—in the *perf.* ידעון (twice), see on 8[3].

(5) On שכני Dt. 33[16], see the note *ad loc.*

(6) The 3 fem. sing. perf. has its original form (preserved also in Aram.) with ת Dt. 32[36] (the only case with the *strong* verb), 31[29], as in Gn. 33[11] Ex. 5[16] Lev. 25[21] 26[34]. But the same form is found also 2 K. 9[37] Kt. Is. 7[14] Jer. 13[19] 44[23] Ez. 24[12] 46[17] Ps. 118[23],—none of which can be said exactly to be *early* passages.

(7) זכורך in 16[16] is derived from the older law of Ex. 23[17]=34[23]; זְכוּרְךָ occurs independently in 20[13]. Elsewhere (including more than 50 times in the Pent.) זָכָר is always used: why זכור occurs these four times we do not know;—it may be an isolated collective form—corresponding to the Arabic "broken plural" *dhukûrun* (König, *Lehrgeb.* ii. 1. 436)—preserved before a suffix (זָכָר never occurs with a suffix).

(8) "Jericho" is spelt in Dt. 32[49] 34[1.3] as uniformly (12 times) in the Pent. יְרֵחוֹ ("Yerēcho"): it is spelt in Jos. (28 times) יְרִיחוֹ (so 2 K. 2[4.4.5.15.18]; יְרִחוֹ (Baer) Jos. 18[21] 2 S. 10[5] Jer. 39[5] 52[8]†; יְרִיחֹה 1 K. 16[34]†); and Mr. Girdlestone (*Lex Mos.* p. 119) thinks that the variation is only naturally to be explained by the supposition that "Israel picked up a new pronunciation, after they came to the place." How comes it, then, that the supposed older pronunciation (*Yerēcho*) recurs 2 K. 25[5] Ezr. 2[34] Neh. 3[2] 7[36] 1 Ch.

Digitized by Google

$6^{63\,(78)}$ 19^{5} 2 Ch. 28^{15}†? Were these books also written by Moses? The same writer's statement (*Foundations of the Bible*, p. 177), that "the Chronicler gives an extract from a document which retains the oldest spelling," is incorrect; 1 Ch. $6^{63\,(78)}$ corresponds to Jos. 21^{36}, where the clause with Jericho has fallen out; but throughout Jos. the word is spelt with *i* (comp., in the same phrase, Jos. 20^{8}); and 1 Ch. 19^{5} is from 2 S. 10^{5}, where it is also spelt with *i*. Even if the distinction were original, therefore, no argument could be founded upon it for the antiquity of the Pent.: but in point of fact—comp. esp. 2 K. 25^{5} with Jer. 39^{5} 52^{8}, where *in one and the same sentence* it is pointed differently in the two books—it can scarcely be doubted that it is one which grew up arbitrarily at a very late date.

(9) Other words peculiar to Dt. (or the Pent.), collected by Keil and others—most recently in *Lex Mosaica*, p. 473 f.—as evidence of its antiquity, are altogether inconclusive: there is nothing connected with the words themselves suggestive of antiquity, except their occurrence in books reputed to be ancient: the argument founded upon them is consequently circular. Every book of the OT. has words and expressions peculiar to itself; and it would be as reasonable to collect those occurring in Sam. or Isaiah, and to argue from them that they belong to the Mosaic age.—Nos. 4 (in the impf.), 5, 6 are no doubt genuine examples of older forms; but (1) they are too isolated, and (2) they occur too frequently in books *other than the Pent.*, to be any evidence of the superior antiquity of the latter. Were the occurrence of these—and of two or three similar forms (see *L.O.T.* ed. 5, p. 527 f., ed. 6, p. 125)—really due to antiquity, it would be *more uniform*, and the general literary style of the Pent. would display a perceptibly archaic flavour, instead of being (as it is) virtually indistinguishable from that of books written confessedly under the monarchy.

Particular words or forms (apart from more general literary features), harmonizing with a date in the 7th cent. B.C., are—the Nithp. conj. נִכַּפֵּר 21^{8} (see note); the Aramaism מִסַּת 16^{10}; the form מסכנות 8^{9} (derived from an adj. מִסְכֵּן *poor*, which is not found in classical Hebrew, though common in Aram., and hence in late Heb., Eccl. 4^{13} $9^{15.\,16}$); perhaps also למסע 10^{1} (see note). The form צִמָּאוֹן 8^{15} (so חפזון 16^{3}; שדפון, ירקון 28^{22}; שגעון, עורון, תמהון 28^{28}; כליון 28^{65}) is not very common in early writings (though instances occur: see König, *Lehrgeb.* ii. 1. 129 f.). The fem. form of the inf.—viz. יראה and אהבה 4^{10} 7^{8} 10^{12} and frequently; שִׂנְאָה 1^{27} 9^{28}; דָּבְקָה 11^{22} 30^{20} (so Jos. 22^{5})—has also been cited in the same connexion; and it is true that most examples of this belong to the later language (*Journal of Philol.* xi. 235 f.): but יראה and אהבה can both be shown independently to have been in use early (2 S. 3^{11} Is. 29^{13}; Gn. 29^{20} 2 S. 18^{3} 19^{7} 20^{17}); so that only two are added by Dt.

Digitized by Google

(Hos. 5^{2}—if the text be sound (cf. Wellh. *Die Kleinen Propheten*, *ad loc.*)—has שחטה, and 7^{4} חָמְצָה : Is. 30^{19} שְׁמָעָה).

The influence of Dt. is very perceptible in the literature of the OT. Upon its promulgation, it speedily became the book which both gave the religious ideal of the age, and moulded the phraseology in which it was expressed. The style of Deuteronomy, when once it had been formed, lent itself readily to adoption; and thus a school of writers, imbued with its spirit, quickly arose, who have stamped their mark upon many parts of the OT. Even the original Deuteronomy appears (p. lxxv) in places to have received expansion at the hands of a Deuteronomic editor (or editors). In the historical books, long sections of Joshua—*e.g.* c. 1 22^{1-6} 23—besides many shorter passages elsewhere,* are constructed all but entirely of Deuteronomic phrases: in the books of Judges and Kings, passages constantly occur, distinguished from the general current of the narrative by their strongly marked Deuteronomic style, and evidently either entirely composed, or (in some cases) expanded from a narrative originally briefer, by a distinct writer, viz. the compiler or editor.† The Deuteronomic passages in the historical books do not usually contain much incident; they consist mostly either of speeches (or additions to speeches), placed in the mouths of prominent historical characters, and reflecting in various ways the Deuteronomic point of view, or else of comments passed by the compiler upon the religious aspects of the history: in the book of Joshua, for instance, the Deuteronomic additions (in harmony with the spirit of Dt. 31^{1-8}) have chiefly the aim of illustrating the zeal shown by Joshua in fulfilling Mosaic

* Insertions in, or expansions of, the original narrative; as 2^{10-11} 3^{7} $4^{14. 21-24}$ 5^{1} 8^{1-2} (in parts), $^{30-35}$ &c.; and the generalizing summaries 10^{28-43} 11^{10-15} 13^{1-12} &c. (*L.O.T.* p. 97 ff.).

† As Jud. 2^{11-23} 3^{4-6}; and (in their present form) $3^{7-11. 12-15a}$ 4^{1-3} 6^{1} 10^{6-16} (*L.O.T.* p. 154 ff.); 1 K. 2^{3-4} $3^{2-3. 14}$ 8^{23-61} 9^{1-9} 11^{1-13} (in its present form), $^{32-39}$ $14^{19-20. 21-24}$ 15^{3-5} &c., 21^{20b-26}; 2 K. 9^{7-10a} $17^{7-23. 34b-40}$ 18^{15-19} &c. (*ib.* pp. 175 ff., 190–193). The references in Kings to the "law" (with or without the name of Moses) are all, as either the context or the phraseology shows, specifically to Dt.: see 1 K. 2^{3} 8^{9} (Dt. 10^{5} 29^{1}); 8^{53} (4^{20} 7^{6}); 8^{56} ($12^{9f.}$ 25^{19}; cf. also Jos. $21^{42. 43 (44. 45)}$ 23^{14} in D^{2}); 2 K. 10^{31}; 14^{6} (Dt. 24^{16}); $18^{6. 12}$ 21^{8} 22^{8} $23^{21. 25}$; and comp. the passages cited p. lxxxi, No. 37.

Digitized by Google

ordinances; in the books of Kings, they are largely estimates of the character of the kings, or reflexions on the national history.* Differences should, however, be noted, as well as resemblances: many of these passages, for instance, contain *new* phrases not found in Dt. itself; † and it is interesting to note what is on the whole an increasing accumulation of deviations from the original Deuteronomic type, till in (*e.g.*) 2 K. 17 it is mingled with phrases derived from the Book of Kings itself, Judges, and Jer. It is but seldom, moreover, that the writers who thus fell under the Deuteronomic spell show the same delicate sense of symmetry and balance; Jer., especially, instead of rounding off his sentences at the right point, is apt to throw into them more than the rhythm will properly bear. The prayers in Neh. 1^{5-11} $9^{6ff.}$ Dan. 9^{4-19} are likewise largely moulded in the Deuteronomic phraseology—under its influence even the author of Daniel (whose Hebrew, as a rule, is laboured and uncouth) becomes fluent. The Chronicler, also, though his general style is as unlike that of Dt. as can well be imagined, sometimes lets his thoughts run in Deuteronomic phrases.‡ Among the prophets, Jeremiah, as is well known, especially in his prose passages, shows most prominently the influence of Dt.: reminiscences from Dt., consisting often of whole clauses, are interwoven with phrases peculiar to Jer. himself; and even where the words are not actually the same, the thought, and the oratorical form—the copious diction, and sustained periods—are frequently similar.

* In the books of Samuel there are no parts with the same strongly marked character. On passages in these books which display a partial affinity to Dt., see p. lxxxvi, *note*.

† As 1 K. 2^{4} *observe their way*, and *walk before me in faithfulness* (cf. 3^{6} 2 K. 20^{3}); *a whole* (or *perfect*) *heart*, 1 K. 8^{61} 11^{4} $15^{3.14}$ 2 K. 20^{3}; to *dismiss* (שלח), *cast away* (השליך), or *remove* (הסיר), *from before my* (*his*) *face*, 1 K. 9^{7}; 2 K. 13^{23} 17^{20} 24^{20}; 2 K. $17^{18.23}$ 23^{27} 24^{3} (also in Jer.); *to bring evil upon*, 1 K. 9^{9} 14^{10} $21^{21.29}$ 2 K. 21^{21} $22^{16.20}$ (and often in Jer.); *to turn from one's evil way* (*ways*) 1 K. 13^{33} 2 K. 17^{13} Jer. 18^{11} 25^{5} 26^{3} 35^{15} $36^{3.7}$ (cf. 23^{22}), Ez. 33^{11} (cf. 13^{22}), Zech. 1^{4} Jon. 3^{8}; מאס *to reject* (Jehovah, His people) 2 K. 17^{20} 23^{27} Jer. 7^{29} 14^{19} 31^{37}; מכר *to sell* (fig.) Jud. 2^{14} 3^{8} 4^{2} 10^{7} (so only in the Song, Dt. 32^{30}); נטש of Jehovah's *forsaking* His people, Jud. 6^{13} 1 S. 12^{22} (=Ps. 94^{14}), 1 K. 8^{57} 2 K. 21^{14} (also Is. 2^{6} Jer. 7^{29} 12^{7} $23^{33.39}$).

‡ Comp. p. lxxxi, Nos. 35, 38; p. lxxxiii, No. 68*a*; 1 Ch. 29^{19}.

Digitized by Google

Comp., for instance, Jer. 7^{1-28} 11^{1-8} 16^{1-13} 21^{3-10} 26 27^{5-11} 29^{5-20} 32^{17-23} 34^{8-22} 44. Zunz (*ZDMG.* 1873, pp. 671-673=*Gesammelte Schriften*, i. 219-222) has transcribed in parallel columns 66 passages of Dt., of which there are echoes in not less than 86 of Jer.; and he certainly has not exhausted all that could be found. A few specimens are here given :—

Deuteronomy		Jeremiah	
4^{10}	ליראה אותי כל הימים	32^{39}	ליראה אותי כל הימים לטוב להם
6^{24}	ליראה את י׳ אלהינו לטוב לנו כל הימים		
4^{20}	ויצא אתכם מכור הברזל ממצרים	11^{4}	ביום הוציאי אותם מארץ מצרים מכור הברזל
4^{29}	ובקשתם משם את י׳ אלהיך ומצאת כי תדרשנו בכל לבבך ובכל נפשך	29^{13}	ובקשתם אתי ומצאתם כי תדרשני בכל לבבכם
4^{34}	באתת ובמופתים ובמלחמה וביד חזקה ובזרוע נטויה ובמוראים גדולים	32^{21}	באתות ובמופתים וביד חזקה ובאזרוע נטויה ובמורא גדול
5^{30}	בכל הדרך אשר צוה י׳ אלהיכם אתכם תלכו למען תחיון וטוב לכם	7^{23}	והלכתם בכל הדרך אשר אצוה אתכם למען ייטב לכם
5^{26}	למען ייטב להם		
8^{19}	והלכת אחרי אלהים אחרים ועבדתם והשתחוית להם	25^{6}	ואל תלכו אחרי אלהים אחרים לעבדם ולהשתחות להם (cf. 13^{10} 16^{11})
18^{20}	לדבר דבר בשמי את אשר לא צויתיו לדבר	29^{23}	וידברו דבר בשמי שקר אשר לוא צויתים
28^{25}	היית לזעוה לכל ממלכות הארץ	15^{4} 24^{9} 29^{18}	ונתתים לזועה לכל ממלכות הארץ (similarly 34^{17})
28^{26}	והיתה נבלתך למאכל לכל עוף השמים ולבהמת הארץ ואין מחריד	7^{33}	והיתה נבלת העם הזה למאכל לעוף השמים ולבהמת הארץ ואין מחריד (similarly 16^{4} 19^{7})
28^{36}	אל גוי אשר לא ידעת אתה ואבותיך ועבדת שם אלהים אחרים עץ ואבן	16^{13}	על הארץ אשר לא ידעתם אתם ואבותיכם ועבדתם שם את אלהים אחרים יומם ולילה
28^{64}	והפיצך יהוה בכל העמים (cf. 4^{27})	9^{15}	והפיצותים בגוים אשר לא ידעו המה ואבותם
28^{49}	עליך גוי מרחק מקצה הארץ כאשר יראה הנשר גוי אשר לא תשמע לשנו	5^{15}	עליכם גוי ממרחק . . . גוי לא תדע לשנו ולא תשמע מה ידבר
28^{52}	חומתיך הגבהות והבצורות אשר אתה בטח בהן	5^{17}	ערי מבצריך אשר אתה בטח בהנה
28^{53}	ואכלת פרי בטנך בשר בניך ובנתיך . . . במצור ובמצוק אשר יציק לך איבך	19^{9}	והאכלתים את בשר בניהם ואת בשר בנתיהם . . . במצור ובמצוק אשר יציקו להם איביהם
28^{63}	היה כאשר שש יהוה עליכם להיטיב אתכם	32^{41}	וששתי עליהם להיטיב אותם
29^{23}	*על מה עשה י׳ ככה לארץ הזאת	22^{8}	על מה עשה י׳ ככה לעיר הגדולה הזאת (cf. 16^{10} 1 K. 9^{8})

Such parallels (the number of which might be readily increased †) are remarkable. They are to be explained, how-

* Comp. also v.$^{24.25}$ with Jer. $16^{11.13}$ 22^{9} 1 K. 9^{9}.

† *E.g.* 10^{11} (Jer. 32^{22}); 11^{28} (7^{9}); 12^{2} תחת כל עץ רענן (2^{20} $3^{6.13}$); 12^{11} לשכן שמו שם (7^{12}); 12^{31} (7^{31}); 13^{6} דבר סרה על י׳ (28^{16} 29^{32}); 13^{18} (42^{12}); $15^{1a.12}$ ($34^{9f.14}$); $26^{8f.}$ ($32^{21f.}$); 26^{19} (13^{11} 33^{9}); 29^{18} (23^{17} 13^{10} 11^{8}); 29^{27} (12^{14}); 29^{27} באף ובחמה ובקצף גדול (21^{5}; cf. 32^{37}); $30^{3.5}$ (29^{14} 30^{3} 33^{26b}); 30^{15} (21^{8}).

Digitized by Google

ever, by the influence, theological and literary, which (as has been remarked above) Dt., after its promulgation, speedily acquired. The opinion that Jer. was the *author* of Dt., though advocated formerly by Colenso,* rests upon a superficial comparison of style, and has been rightly rejected by all subsequent critics. For when the style of the prophet is compared closely with that of Dt., differences disclose themselves, which more than outweigh the similarities, and place identity of authorship out of the question. On the one hand, terms and expressions which are characteristic of Dt., occur rarely in Jer.—*e.g.* to *love* (Jehovah His people), once only, Jer. 31^{3}, (Israel Jehovah) only Jer. 2^{2} (in a fig., never found in Dt.); to *choose* (Jer. 33^{24} only); *to possess* (of Canaan), only 30^{3} 32^{23}; *to observe* (שמר) *the law*, &c., only 16^{11} 35^{18}; or never, as האריך (*prolong* or *be long*, of days), *to observe to do*, *to observe and do*, *gates*, representing *cities* (possibly once, Jer. 14^{2}): Dt. moreover has characteristic epithets of God, which Jer. avoids, as קנא 4^{24} 5^{9} 6^{15}, רחום 4^{31}, נאמן 7^{9}, נורא 7^{21} 10^{17}, אש אכלה 4^{24} 9^{3}. Further, in Dt. לבב is greatly preferred to לב (p. lxxxvii); Jer. prefers לב (57 times + Jer. 51^{1}) to לבב (7 times); in Dt. the term. ן- of the 2nd and 3rd pl. impf. is very frequent (56 times), in Jer. it is rare (5 times): in Dt. אנכי preponderates almost to the exclusion of אני (p. lxxxvii), in Jer. אני (54 times) is more frequent than אנכי (37 times). On the other hand, Jer. shows a fondness for many expressions not found in Dt., as פקד על *to visit upon* (*punish*), *incline the ear* (*L.O.T.* p. 258), *Jehovah of Hosts*, *the sword, the pestilence, and the famine* (*ib.*; not so even in Dt. 28), &c. Jeremiah's style is moreover less chaste and correct than that of Dt.: he also frequently adopts a lyric strain, which is never the case in Dt. As Jer.'s authorship of Dt. is not maintained by critics, further illustrations of the difference of his style will be superfluous: the reader who is interested in the subject may refer to Kleinert, pp. 185–190, 235; Cheyne, *Jeremiah*, p. 81 f.; and esp. to J. L. König's *Alttest. Studien* (ii), 1839 (whose painstaking collection of materials contains, however, much that is irrelevant, and needs careful sifting).

* *The Pentateuch*, &c., iii. 618, vii. 225–227, and App. pp. 85–110 (where a large number of parallels are transcribed).

Digitized by Google

The *text* of Deuteronomy, except in a few passages of c. 32. 33, has been preserved in remarkable purity, and presents none of the problems which arise, for instance, in connexion with the books of Samuel, Jeremiah, or Ezekiel. It admits, however, occasionally of correction by the aid of the Ancient Versions: the passages in which this is the case will be found noted in the Commentary.

Digitized by Google

COMMENTARY.

I. 1–5. *Historical Introduction.*

I. 1–5. Introduction, specifying the place and time at which the discourses following were delivered.—1. *All Israel*] an expression much used in Dt., and the Deuteronomic sections of Joshua. It occurs, as here, after a verb of addressing, 5^{1} 27^{9} 29^{1} 31^{1} 32^{45} Jos. 23^{2}; with *before the eyes of* (or *before*) $31^{7.11}$ 34^{12} Jos. 3^{7} 4^{14}; as subject of a verb 13^{12} 21^{21} 31^{11} Jos. 3^{17} $7^{24.25}$ $8^{15.21.24.33}$ $10^{15.20.31.34.36.38.43}$; rather differently (with *from* or *in the midst of*) Dt. 11^{6} 18^{6}. It is not so used besides in the Hex., Ex. 18^{25} (with *from*) Nu. 16^{34} (followed by the limiting clause אשר סביבתיהם) being both different.—*Beyond Jordan*] *i.e.* on the E. side of Jordan, from the standpoint of W. Palestine. So 1^{5} 3^{8} $4^{41.46.47.49}$. See more fully on this expression in the Introduction, § 4.—*In the wilderness, in the 'Arábah, in front of Suph, between Paran* (on the one hand) *and Tophel and Laban and Ḥaẓéroth and Di-zahab* (on the other)] these words occasion difficulty. On the one hand, from the position which they occupy, it seems natural to suppose that they are intended to define more particularly the exact spot "beyond Jordan" where Moses delivered the discourses which follow; on the other hand, the names are other-

I. 1. מוּל] only here, for the normal מוֹל, perhaps for the sake of dissimilation from the following סוּף.—בין פארן ובין תפל ו . . . ו . . . ו . . .] the rend. given above is the only one which accords with Hebrew usage, "between . . . and" being expressed regularly by בין . . . ובין (or בין . . . ל), but not by בין . . . ו. The supposition that ב *in* is to be carried on in thought from בערבה, and understood before לבן וחצרות ודי־זהב is not probable; Hebrew idiom, in such cases, *repeats* the preposition.

wise unknown as those of places situated in that locality, while at least three of them occur in connexion with the earlier period of the Israelites' wanderings (Suph in the Heb. name of the Red Sea, "Sea of Suph," Paran Nu. 10^{12} *al.*, Ḥaẓeroth Nu. 11^{35} $33^{17f.}$). Accordingly many efforts have been made by commentators to refer the names to the earlier period of the forty years' journeyings.

Knobel supposed that the verse was retrospective, referring to the various communications made by Moses to the people, and recorded in Ex.-Nu. This interpretation is possible, so far as the usage of אלה *these* is concerned (which may point indifferently backwards, Nu. 36^{13}, or forwards, Dt. 12^{1}), but improbable, in view of the position which the verse occupies at the beginning of a new book, and in view also of the fact that none of the places mentioned are named in the preceding narrative in connexion with the promulgation of laws to the people. It is indeed insisted by Klost. (*Pent.* p. 131) that Knobel's view of אלה is the only one consistent with the context; but this opinion depends upon a very questionable explanation of the v. as a whole (*ib.* p. 130). Schultz and Keil, treating likewise the names as those of places passed by the Israelites in the earlier stages of their wanderings, supposed that the words were meant to describe the country on the opposite side of Jordan, in contrast to the land of promise, as *part* of the same great wilderness, conceived as a kind of ideal unity, which the Israelites entered after crossing the Red Sea (Ex. 15^{22}); but this explanation is very forced and artificial: it is not credible that the writer, if such a thought had been in his mind, would have so expressed himself as to *identify* localities altogether distinct. Nor was Hengstenberg's explanation (*Bileam*, p. 221 ff.) more probable. Di. conjectures that v.$^{1b-2}$ is a fragment of D's itinerary of the Israelites, prefixed by the compiler of Dt. to the discourses of Moses, and afterwards, as further changes were introduced into the text, abbreviated by the omission of what was already known from the narrative of Ex.-Nu. But it does not seem probable that the description of a *route* would be so altered as to become (what v.^{1b} manifestly is) the description of a *locality*. None of these explanations can therefore be said to be satisfactory.

In the wilderness] an indeterminate expression, which may denote either the wilderness of the wanderings, between the Sinaitic peninsula and the South of Canaan, or the wilderness on the East of Moab (Nu. $21^{11.13}$ Dt. 2^{8b} cf. 4^{43}). But the term must be used somewhat inexactly, if it be applied to a locality in the "ʿArábah" (see the next note) on the *West* of Moab.—*The ʿArábah*] this geographical term occurs here in the OT. for the first time. It denotes (cf. RV. *marg.*) the deep depression through which the Jordan flows, in which the Dead

Digitized by Google

Sea is situate, and which is prolonged S. of this to the Gulf of 'Akabah. At present the northern part of this valley is called *el-Ghôr* (الغور), i.e. *the Hollow* or *Depression;* but the southern part, from a line of chalk cliffs which sweep across it about 6 miles S. of the lower end of the Dead Sea, still retains the ancient name of the whole, the *Wādy* (or *Valley:* see on 2^{13}) *el-'Arăbah* (العربة). Those who refer v.^{1b} to the earlier stages of the Israelites' wanderings, suppose naturally this southern part of the 'Arábah to be here meant (as is certainly the case in 2^{8}); but the term may denote with equal propriety the Jordan-valley North of the Dead Sea (as 1^{7} 11^{30} 1 S. 23^{24} *al.*).

See further on the 'Arábah, Robinson, *BR.* ii. 113 ff., 183 ff., iii. 333-5; Ges. *Thes. s.v.* ערבה; Smith, *DB. s.v.; S. & P.* pp. 84 f., 487 f.; Tristram, *Land of Israel* (ed. 4), pp. 217 f., 234, 320-4, 446; J. W. Dawson, *Egypt and Syria*, chap. v.; and esp. Prof. Edw. Hull's *Mount Seir, Sinai, and W. Palestine* (1889), pp. 75 ff., 104 ff., 108 ff., 178 ff. The Ghôr is a valley, the floor of which consists largely of alluvial deposit, flanked on each side by ranges of hills, 2000 feet or more in elevation, and varying in breadth from 2-3 to 14 miles across (Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine*, chap. xiv.). The floor of the Ghôr, in the plain of Jericho, consists of a series of plateaux, descending by stages to the Jordan, which can only have been deposited by the agency of water; they are thus an indication that the Jordan was once a much larger and deeper stream than it is at present, and, in fact, that during the glacial period it formed a great inland sea, extending from Lake Ḥuleh on the N. to the ridge of Samrat Fiddan (Hull, pp. 100 f., 180-3), which crosses the present Wādy-el-'Arabah about 30 miles S. of the Dead Sea (but *not* communicating with the Red Sea). The general character of the Wādy-el-'Arabah is that of a desolate and arid valley, from 4 to 15 miles across, bounded on the E. by ranges of porphyry and granite (in the midst of which are nestled the fertile glens and valleys which formed the ancient Edom), and on the W. by the sterile cliffs of sandstone and limestone, rising to a height of some 1500 feet above the floor of the depression, which form the abrupt margin of the Tih (pp. 4, 20) plateau. See the excellent geological map in Prof. Hull's *Geology and Geography of Palestine* (Pal. Expl. Society), 1886.

In front of Suph] perhaps the same as Suphah Nu. 21^{14}, which must have been in the neighbourhood of Moab, though the exact site is unknown. 𝔊𝔙𝔒 treat Suph as abbreviated for "the Sea of Suph," *i.e.* the Red Sea; but this abbreviation is not found elsewhere; nor, as the name "Sea of Suph" appears to be derived, not from a locality "Suph," but from

Digitized by Google

the reedy growth, called by the Hebrews *suph*, with which the Red Sea abounded, can it be said to be a probable one. The pass, Naḳb-eṣ-Ṣafā, some 25 miles WSW. of the Dead Sea, suggested by Knob., is unsuitably situated; nor does the name agree phonetically (for ص corresponds to צ, not to ס).—*Between Paran and Tophel, &c.*] the "wilderness of Paran" (Gn. 21^{21} Nu. 10^{12} 12^{16} $13^{3.26}$ 1 S. 25^{1} [MT.]†), so far as can be judged, corresponds generally with what is now called the wilderness of *et-Tih*, the bare and elevated table-land of limestone, bounded on the S. by the mountains of the Sinaitic peninsula, on the E. by the ʿArabah and the north end of the Gulf of ʿAḳabah, on the W. by the wilderness of Shur, and on the N. by the wilderness of Ẓin (צִן) and the south of Judah (*S. & P.* p. 7); Rob. *BR.* i. 177 f.; Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 284 ff.). The site of Paran (1 K. 11^{18}: cf. הר פארן Dt. 33^{2} Hab. 3^{3}), from which this wilderness derives its name, is, however, unknown: the Wady Feiran, near Jebel Serbal, which has been suggested, seems to be too much secluded by intervening mountains from the great plateau itself to have given it its name. From 1 K. $11^{17f.}$ it may be inferred that Paran lay between Midian and Egypt. If, however, the present verse describes the scene of Moses' discourse in the territory of Moab, a different Paran altogether, not otherwise known, will, of course, be intended.—*Tophel*] this has been generally identified with *eṭ-Ṭafîle*, a large village situated in a well-watered valley on the route from Kerak to Petra, about 15 miles SSE. of the Dead Sea (Rob. *BR.* ii. 167; Bäd. 191). But the ṭ (ط) does not correspond phonetically; and the identification depends upon the assumption that some halting-place belonging to the period of the forty years' wanderings is referred to.—*Laban and Ḥaẓéroth*] if places in the Israelites' wanderings are meant, these may be identical with Libnah and Ḥaẓéroth, Nu. $33^{20.17}$. The site of Libnah is not known. Ḥaẓéroth (also Nu. 11^{35}) is usually identified with ʿAin-el-Ḥuḍra, about half-way between Sinai and ʿAḳabah (Rob. i. 151; Ew. ii. 191; &c.). Otherwise the names will denote localities, not elsewhere mentioned, in Moab.—*Di-zahab*] the name suggests some place productive of *gold* (hence 𝔊

Digitized by Google

Καταχρύσεα). It has been identified by Burckhardt, *Syria* (1822), p. 523, Knobel, and others with Mina-ed-Dhahab, "as Vollers tells me from local information, the third of seven boat-harbours between the Rās Muḥammad and ʿAḳaba" (W. R. Smith, MS. note), nearly due E. of Jebel Mûsa. It is objected by Keil that Mina-ed-Dhahab is too inaccessible on the side of Sinai for the Israelites to have made it one of their halting-places; he consequently considers the name to be that of a place, otherwise unknown, in the desert of the wanderings. Upon the view that the verse is descriptive of a locality in Moab, the name will, of course, be that of an undetermined site in that neighbourhood.—It results from what has been said that v.[1b] presents difficulties which, in the present state of our knowledge, do not admit of a satisfactory solution. Interpreted in their obvious sense, the words define (otherwise than is done in 3^{29} 4^{46}) the locality East of Jordan in which the following discourses were delivered. It is some objection to this view that, as has been said, the names are not otherwise known as belonging to this neighbourhood, while at least some of them do occur as those of places passed by the Israelites during their wanderings. But in the position in which the clause now stands it seems impossible, if the latter reference be adopted, to interpret it, as a whole, in any satisfactory or intelligible sense. It is not improbable that the words, from some cause or other, have been transplanted from their original context.

2. *It is eleven days, &c.*] the words convey an approximate idea of the distance from Ḥoreb, the scene of the delivery of the Law, to Kadesh-barneaʿ, on the S. border of the Promised Land. The time specified agrees with the narratives of modern travellers: Robinson, for instance, travelling in 1838 from Jebel Mûsa to ʿAḳabah, and hence across the desert to the neighbourhood of ʿAin Ḳadis, occupied exactly

2. די זהב] the name is curious. The ־ִי (if correct) suggests at once the oblique case of ذُو *possessor of* (often in names of both persons and places); but it is not apparent how an Arabic ذُو ذَهَب should be expressed in Hebrew by די זהב, the ذ being represented differently in the two parts of the name.

Digitized by Google

11 days on the journey (*BR.* ii. 565–7). The distance would be about 160–70 miles.—*Ḥoreb*] the name given uniformly in Dt. (except in the Blessing 33^{2}) to Sinai (Dt. $1^{2.6.19}$ $4^{10.15}$ 5^{2} 9^{8} 18^{16} 28^{69}; comp. 1 K. 8^{9} = 2 Ch. 5^{10}, in a Deuteronomic passage): elsewhere only Ex. 3^{1} 17^{6} 33^{6} (all apparently E); 1 K. 19^{8} Mal. 3^{22} Ps. 106^{19}†. No topographical distinction is traceable between Ḥoreb and Sinai; they are "different names of the same locality, interchanging only according to different writers, or, as in Sir. 48^{7}, in the parallel members of the same verse" (Dillm. on Ex. 3^{1}).—*by way of Mount Se'ir*] or, perhaps, *by the Mount Se'ir Road.* The words define the particular route from Ḥoreb to Ḳadesh intended by the writer. There are three main roads leading from Sinai to Palestine; and the easternmost of these, passing by el-'Ain and the well el-Themed, and approaching the mountains of Se'ir, might well be called the "Mount Se'ir Road" (Trumbull, *Kadesh-barnea,* 76 ff.; Rob. *BR.* i. 198 f., 601 ff.). The expression *Mount Se'ir*—or rather (collectively) *the Mountains of Se'ir*—is a common one ($2^{1.5}$ Gn. 32^{8} 36^{9} *al.*): it denotes the mountainous region, E. of the 'Arábah, in which Edom proper lay (*DB. s.v.*).—*Ḳadesh-barnea'*] v.^{19} 2^{14} 9^{23} Nu. 32^{8} 34^{4} Jos. 10^{41} $14^{6.7}$ 15^{3}†: the fuller name of the place elsewhere called simply Ḳadesh (v.^{46} 32^{51} Nu. 13^{26} $20^{1.14.16.22}$ *al.*). Ḳadesh-barnea' was placed by Rob. (ii. 175, 194) at 'Ain-el-Weibeh, on the W. edge of the 'Arábah, 35 miles S. of the Dead Sea, and 22–3 miles NW. of Mount Hor; the Rev. J. Rowlands, however, in 1842 (Williams, *Holy City,* i. 464 ff.), identified it with 'Ain-Ḳadís, about 45 miles W. of 'Ain-el-Weibeh, and 50 miles S. of Beer-sheba'. The site was lost for many years, till it was rediscovered by Trumbull in 1881 (*Kadesh-barnea,* pp. 238–275), and the identification is now generally accepted.

The spring (cf. Nu. 20^{11}) lies in a recess of a low limestone hill-range, in the midst of the arid stone-covered waste. At the foot of a large mass of rock standing out from this range, flows an abundant stream, fertilising the soil around, and forming a veritable oasis in the desert, until after running 300-400 yards it loses itself in the sand. About the stream fig-trees, shrubs, and flowers flourish in profusion; and a carpet of grass covers the ground (Trumbull, 272–5).

Digitized by Google

3. *In the fortieth year, &c.*] this verse fixes the date when the following discourses were delivered. Originally, as can hardly be doubted, it formed part of the narrative of P (who alone, of the Pentateuchal writers, reckons by months and days, or uses the expression עשתי עשר [see below]), being designed as an introduction to the summary account which that narrative appears once to have contained of Moses' final communications to the people, and being followed, almost immediately, by Dt. 32^{48-52} (notice "on this self-same day," v.^{48} *i.e.* on the day specified in 1^{3}). It will have been adapted here, by the final redactor of the Pent., for the purpose of adjusting Dt. to the scheme of P (Wellh. *Hist.* 384 f.). For the general reference of the Deut. legislation to Jehovah, cf. $5^{28\,(31)}$ 6^{1}.—**4.** *After he had smitten Siḥon, &c.*] Nu. 21^{21}–22^{1} (JE). The victories of Israel over Siḥon and ʿOg are a favourite subject of reference with the Deuteronomic writers: cf. not only $2^{26\text{ff.}}$ $3^{1\text{ff.}}$, but also $4^{46\text{f.}}$ $29^{7\text{f.}}$ 31^{4} Jos. 2^{10} 9^{10} 12^{2-6} 13^{10-12} (all D²). The phrase סיחון מלך האמרי אשר יושב בחשבון (so 3^{2} 4^{46}), as Nu. 21^{34}. Ḥeshbon, the capital of Siḥon (now Ḥesbān), was about 14 miles E. of the north end of the Dead Sea: it was afterwards one of the cities assigned to Reuben (Jos. 13^{17}). See further on 2^{26}. ʿOg in Nu. 21^{33} is styled simply the "king of Bashan"; but in Jos. 12^{4} (D²) he is described further as היושב בעשתרות ובאדרעי, "who dwelt in ʿAshtaroth *and* in Edreʿi" (cf. 13^{12} "who reigned in ʿA. *and* E."; 13^{31}). As the text stands, *in Edreʿi* must be construed with *smote* (הכותו), and the sense thus obtained would be in agreement with the fact (Nu. $21^{33\text{b}}$ = Dt. $3^{1\text{b}}$): at the same time, in view of Jos. 12^{4}, it is very possible that 𝔊𝔙 are right in reading "who dwelt in ʿA. *and* in E." Edreʿi appears to have been the second royal city of Bashan; ʿAshtaroth is named also as the residence of ʿOg in Jos. 9^{10}.

3. עשתי עשר (not אחד עשר, as v.^{2}) for "eleven," as Ex. $26^{7.\,8}$ (= $36^{14.\,15}$) Nu. 7^{72} 29^{20} (all P). עשתי is a word used chiefly in the later Hebrew: 2 K. 25^{2} (= Jer. 52^{5}) Jer. 1^{3} 39^{2} Ez. 26^{1} 40^{49} Zech. 1^{7} 1 Ch. 12^{13} 24^{12} 25^{18} $27^{14.\,14}$†.—ככל אשר צוה י׳ אתו] as Ex. $39^{32.\,42}$ 40^{16}; and without כל Nu. 3^{42} 17^{26} 27^{22}, and often with את משה for אתו, as Nu. 1^{19} 2^{33} 3^{51} $8^{3.\,22}$ &c. (all P). For the addition אלהם *unto them*, cf. Ex. 6^{13} 25^{22} (both P).—**4.** אחרי וגו׳] it is best to understand a colon at the end of v.^{3}, and to construe v.^{4} with v.^{5}.

Digitized by Google

The modern name of Edre'i is *Edre'āt*—abbreviated to *Der'āt* and *Der'ā*—on the Southern border of Bashan ($3^{1.10}$), about 30 miles E. of the Sea of Tiberias, and 30 miles W. of the Ḥauran range (the Jebel Ḥauran). For a description of the ruins, and of the remarkable underground dwellings beneath them, see Wetzstein, *Reisebericht über Hauran und die Trachonen*, 1860, p. 47 f.; Schumacher, *Across the Jordan*, pp. 121–147. 'Ashtaroth (in form, the plural of '*Ashtōreth*, the name of the Canaanitish goddess) was no doubt an ancient and prominent seat of 'Ashtoreth worship. Its site is uncertain. According to Eusebius (*Onom.* 209, 213, 268), there were two 'Ashtaroths in Bashan, 9 miles apart, between Adara (Edre'i) and Abila, the 'Ashtaroth of 'Og being 6 miles from Adara: if this statement is correct, it would be best placed at *el-Muzeirīb* (6½ miles NW. of Der'āt), though *Tell el-'Ash'arī*, 3 miles N. of el-Muzeirīb, and *Tell esh-Shihāb*, 3 miles W. of it, have also been suggested. See further p. XVIII.

5. *In the land of Moab*] so 28^{69} 32^{49} $34^{5.6}$. P says always ערבות מואב (see on 34^{1}).—*Set himself to expound* (הוֹאִיל בֵּאֵר)] on both these words see below. *Declare* (AV., RV.) is used in the old and etymological sense of the word, *to make clear*, i.e. *to explain* or *expound* (𝔊 διασαφῆσαι, 𝔙 *explanare*). "The title of Pilkington's Commentary on Haggai (1560) is 'Aggeus the Prophete, *declared* by a large Commentarye'" (W. A. Wright, *Bible Word-Book*, *s.v.*).—*This law*] the supposition that this expression refers to the laws contained in Ex.–Nu. stands on the same footing with the false idea that Dt. is a "recapitulation" of the three preceding books of the Pentateuch. In point of fact, not only cannot the greater part of the laws contained in these books be said, in any sense, to be "declared" or "expounded" in Dt., but the legislation of Dt. includes many provisions not found in these books at all. The expression recurs 4^{8} (cf. ^{44}) $17^{18.19}$ $27^{3.8.26}$ $28^{58.61}$ $29^{28(29)}$ $31^{9.11.12.24}$ 32^{46} (cf. *this book of the law* $29^{20(21)}$ 30^{10} 31^{26} Jos. 1^{8}), and regularly denotes *the code of law embodied in Dt.*, the exposition of which is the primary object of the discourses which follow. The laws of which this code consists are not, as a rule, stated with abstract, naked brevity; they are accompanied with

5. הוֹאִיל] the idea expressed by the word is *to resolve, take upon oneself, set oneself*,—whether as opposed to internal reluctance or diffidence (Gn. $18^{27.31}$), or to external opposition (Jud. $1^{27.35}$). The rend. "began" (AV., RV.) is weak and inadequate. The constr. הואיל בּאר, exactly as Hos. 5^{11}: see G-K. § 120. 2^{b}, Ew. § 285^{b}, or the writer's note on 1 S. 2^{3}.—בַּאֵר] cf. 27^{8} Hab. 2^{2} (to "make plain," of writing). In post-Biblical Hebrew, בּאר is common in the sense *explain*, בּיאור being an *exposition*, or *commentary*.

Digitized by Google

hortatory introductions and comments; *i.e.* they are "expounded" or "explained."

I. 6–IV. 40. *Moses' First Discourse.*

This discourse consist of two parts, the first (1^{6}–3^{29}) comprising a review of the principal incidents which had taken place between the Israelites' departure from Ḥoreb and their arrival at "the ravine in front of Beth-Peʿor," in the land of Moab; and the second (4^{1-40}) consisting of an eloquent practical appeal addressed to the nation, urging it, as the condition of its prosperity, not to forget the great truths of the spirituality of Jehovah, and of His sole and exclusive Godhead, impressed upon it at Ḥoreb.—On the question whether this discourse is by the same hand as the body of Dt. (c. 5–26. 28), see the Introduction, § 4.

(1.) **I. 6–III. 29. Introductory Retrospect.**—The retrospect begins by recalling to the Israelites' memory how they had been divinely commanded to break up from Ḥoreb, and advance to take possession of the Promised Land (1^{6-8}); how thereupon, the arrangements for the administration of justice having been first of all, at Moses' suggestion, remodelled and improved (1^{6-18}), the nation crossed the desert and arrived at Ḳadesh-barneaʿ (1^{19}); and how, in consequence of the events which there took place, the Israelites were condemned to wander for an entire generation in the wilderness (1^{20-46}). After this, the narrative recounts the Israelites' circuit of the lands of Edom and Moab (2^{1-25}), their conquest of Siḥon and ʿOg, and the division of their territory among the 2½ tribes (2^{26}–3^{17}), the obligation laid upon these tribes to assist their brethren in the conquest of Canaan (3^{18-22}), and the confirmation of Joshua's nomination (1^{38}) as Moses' successor in the leadership of the people (3^{23-29}). The narrative is so told as to explain, in particular, how it happened (1) that Israel did not effect an entrance into Canaan from the South; (2) that Edom, Moab, and the ʿAmmonites remained as neighbours of the Israelites, while the territory of Siḥon and ʿOg was occupied by them. In this retrospect the narrative is throughout

Digitized by Google

dependent upon that of JE in Exodus and Numbers, and phrases are frequently borrowed *verbatim* from it. The following tables will, it is hoped, assist the reader to understand the relation in which the retrospect of Dt. stands to the earlier narrative of JE. The number of cases is remarkable in which, while there is a coincidence in language, the passage quoted does not describe the same event, but is borrowed *from another part of the narrative;* these are indicated in the tables by a parenthesis. In the passages to which "Cf." is prefixed, the correspondence is not verbal.

Dt. 1^{7a}	(Nu. 14^{25} פנו וסעו לכם.)
^{9b}	(Nu. 11^{14} לא אוכל אנכי לבדי לשאת את כל העם הזה.)
^{12}	(Nu. 11^{17b} ונשאו אתך במשא העם ולא תשא אתה לבדך.)
^{13a}	Cf. Ex. 18^{21a}.
^{15}	Ex. 18^{25} ויתן אתם ראשים על העם שרי אלפים שרי מאות שרי חמשים ושרי עשרות.
^{17b}	Ex. $18^{22.26}$ את הדבר הקשה יביאון אל משה.
^{18}	Cf. Ex. $24^{3.7}$.

6–8. How the Israelites, having completed the purpose of their sojourn at Ḥoreb, were commanded to advance and take possession of the land promised to their fathers.—6. *Jehovah, our God*] 23 times in Dt. (c. 1–6, and c. 29); elsewhere in the Pent. only Ex. 3^{18} 5^{3} $8^{6.22.23}$ $10^{25.26}$ (all JE). The same expression with other pronouns (*thy, your*) is still more frequent in Dt. (on 1^{21}). It is intended to emphasize the close relationship subsisting between Israel and its God,—a relationship sealed by the covenant concluded at Ḥoreb (5^{2}), and forming the ground on which the claim to Israel's obedience is specially rested.—**7.** *Turn you, and take your journey*] exactly as Nu. 14^{25}, though there in a different connexion, viz. in the command to turn back from Ḳadesh, and re-enter the wilderness.—*The hill-country of the Amorites*] v.$^{19.20}$ (comp. v.^{44} Nu. 13^{29}). *Amorite* is here used as the general designation in D (as in E) of the pre-Israelitish population of Canaan, and of the

6. רב לכם שבת בהר הזה] lit. "the dwelling in this mountain is much for you," idiom. for "is *too much*, is *enough*"; so 2^{3}. Elsewhere an inf. with מן follows ("*than that* ye should . . .") 1 K. 12^{28}, cf. Ez. 44^{6} (in both these cases, however, the ם after לכם is possibly due to dittography) Ex. 9^{28}. Comp. רב לכם (absolutely) 3^{26} Nu. $16^{3.7}$ Ez. 45^{9}; and רב alone 2 S. 24^{16} (= 1 Ch. 21^{15}) 1 K. 19^{4}.—**7.** פנו וסעו לכם] v.^{40} פנו לכם וסעו, 2^{3} 5^{27} שובו לכם. The reflexive

Digitized by Google

territory E. of Jordan occupied by the Israelites. The "hill-country" meant (as v.^{20} shows) is more particularly the S. part of the high ground of Canaan.

Amorite is used (1) Nu. $21^{13. 21}$, and frequently, of the peoples ruled by Siḥon and 'Og, E. of Jordan, conquered by the Israelites; (2) as the general designation of the pre-Israelitish population of the territory W. of Jordan, especially in the Pent. writers, E and D, and occasionally besides: as thus applied, the term, though possessing a general connotation, may naturally be used with reference to the inhabitants of a particular district: Gn. 15^{16} 48^{22} Dt. 1^{7*} (* בהר) $^{19*. 20*. 27. 44*}$ Jos. 7^{7} ('Ai) 10^{5} (Jerusalem, Ḥebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, 'Eglon) $^{6*. 12}$ 24^{12} (read with 𝔊 *twelve* for *two*, of the kings W. of Jordan) $^{15. 18}$ (cf. Am. $2^{9. 10}$) Jud. $1^{34f. 36}$ (unless אמרי be here an error for אדמי) 6^{10} 1 S. 7^{14} 2 S. 21^{2} (יתר האמרי, of the Gibe'onites) 1 K. 21^{26} 2 K. 21^{11}; cf. Gn. $14^{7. 13}$; and beside the Canaanites, in passages where the latter term seems used specially of the inhabitants of the sea-coast, or the Jordan-valley, Nu. 13^{29*} Jos. 5^{1} 13^{4} (text dub.; see Di.), perhaps also here; (3) in enumerations of the nations of Canaan (W. of Jordan) dispossessed by the Israelites, by the side of the Canaanite, Ḥittite, &c. (see on 7^{1}).

Canaanite, on the other hand, is the general designation of the pre-Israelitish population of the territory W. of Jordan preferred by J: D and D^{2} (in Jos.), using "Amorite" in the wider sense noticed above, show a tendency to limit "Canaanite" to the inhabitants of the sea-coast and of the Jordan-valley: (1) Gn. 10^{19} (extending from Ẓidon on the N. to Gaza on the SW., and to Lesha'—*i.e.* acc. to tradition, Kallirrhoe, E. of the Dead Sea—on the SE.: comp. the tribes named as "sons" of Canaan, in v.$^{15-18}$) 12^{6} $24^{3. 37}$ 50^{11} Ex. 13^{11} Nu. 13^{29} 14^{25} (near Ḳadesh) $^{43. 45}$ $21^{1. 3}$ (=33^{40}; in the Negeb) Dt. 1^{7} (see p. 13 f.) 11^{30} (in the 'Arábah) Jos. 5^{1} 11^{3} ("on the east," *i.e.* in the 'Arábah; "on the west," *i.e.* on the Medit. Sea) $13^{3. 4}$ 16^{10} (in Gezer, of Ephraim: so Jud. 1^{29} 1 K. 9^{16}) $17^{12ff. 16}$ (in the "land of the vale" בארץ העמק, about Beth-Shean and Jezreel) ^{18} Jud. $1^{1. 3. 9. 10. 17. 27f. 29. 30. 32. 33}$ 3^{3}: cf. 2 S. 24^{7} Neh. 9^{24}; (2) it occurs, together with Amorite, Ḥittite, &c., in enumerations of the nations of Canaan (on 7^{1}). If the passages here cited be examined in detail, they will be found, it is believed, to support the distinction laid down above, which is accepted generally by modern writers (cf. Wellh. *Comp.* p. 341 f.; E. Meyer, *ZATW.* 1881, 121 ff., 139 ff.; Budde, *Bibl. Urgesch.* pp. 344-8; Dillm. on Gn. 10^{16} Dt. 1^{7} and pp. 617 f., 626; Delitzsch on Gn. 48^{22}).

ל, throwing back the action denoted by the verb upon the subject, and referring it, as it were, to the pleasure or option of the agent, gives more or less pathetic expression to the *personal* feelings—the satisfaction, or the interest, or the promptitude—with which the action in question is (or is to be) accomplished. The idiom is most common with the 1st or 2nd person (esp. in the imper.), but is found also with the 3rd pers. It is used not only with verbs of motion (Gn. 12^{1} 22^{2} 27^{43}), but also with trans. verbs (see on v.^{13}: cf. *Lex.* ל 5 h; G-K. § 119. $3c^{2}$). נסע is properly to *pluck up* (the pegs of a tent), hence *to journey by stages*: cf. מַסָּע *stage* (of a journey), Gn. 13^{3} Ex. 17^{1} *al.*—כל שכניו] *all his neighbours*, viz. of האמרי.

Digitized by Google

According to Sayce (*Races of the OT.* 1891, pp. 55 f., 101 f.: cf. 110–117), the Tel-el-Amarna tablets show, that in the 15th cent. B.C. *Amurra* (*i.e.* Amorite) denotes exclusively the inhabitants on the *North* of Canaan (including Ḳadesh on the Orontes), while *Kinakhkhi*, which is said to correspond to כנען, denotes the region between Gebal on the N. and the Philistines on the S. This, however, relates to a period long anterior to that at which the Biblical records were composed; and in the interval, the Amorites, it seems, must have extended themselves Southwards, and secured a footing in "Canaan" beside the Canaanites, as also on the E. of Jordan, in the territory ruled by Siḥon and 'Og. From the Inscriptions of Seti I. and Ramses III. (Brugsch, *Hist. of Eg.*[2] ii. 14 f., 154), it may even perhaps be inferred (Budde, *l.c.* p. 346 f.) that in the 14th cent. B.C. (see on the date *RP.*[2] vi. 148) the names *land of Amār* and *land of Kanāna* were already used interchangeably as designations of Palestine.

It would thus seem, so far as can be judged from the Biblical and other data at present at our disposal, that "Canaan," before it came into the possession of the Israelites, must have been occupied principally by two tribes, the Amorites and the Canaanites, each sufficiently numerous and prominent to supply a designation of the entire country; the former, it may perhaps be inferred, resident chiefly in the high central ground of Palestine, the latter chiefly in the lower districts on the W. and E.* From a survey of the passages quoted, it appears, further, that, as Wellh. (*Comp.* p. 341) remarks, while the Canaanites are often alluded to as still resident in the land in the age of the Biblical writers, especially in the cities of the plains not conquered by the Israelites, the Amorites are usually referred to as the *past* population of Canaan, expelled by the Israelites, and as such are invested with semi-mythical attributes, and described as giants (cf. Am. 2⁹ Dt. 1²⁸).—*The 'Arábah*] see on v.¹. The northern part, the modern Ghôr, the depression containing the Jordan and the Dead Sea, is, of course, here meant.—*The hill-country*] the elevated ground in the centre of Palestine, especially Ephraim, Benjamin, and Judah (cf. 3²⁵).—*The lowland*] the *Shephélah* (fem. of שָׁפֵל *low*), the technical designation of the low hills and flat valley land (G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography*

* The idea, however, which is often put forward, that "Canaan" *means* etymologically "lowlander," is destitute of philological support, in either Hebrew or Arabic; see G. F. Moore, *American Or. Soc. Proc.* 1890, pp. lxvii–lxx.

Digitized by Google

of the Holy Land, p. 201 ff.), which formed the W. and SW. portion of Judah, sloping down towards the Mediterranean Sea, and extending from Ajalon and Gimzo (near Lydda) on the N. to Lachish (Tell-el-Ḥesy) on the S. The extent of the Shephélah may be inferred from the cities of Judah enumerated as belonging to it, Jos. 15^{33-44}. The soil is fertile; and it has been called "the corn-field of Palestine." The term is found, as here, in descriptive summaries of Palestine (or Judah), Jos. 9^{1} 10^{40} 12^{8} Jer. 17^{26} 32^{44} *al.* Cf. *S. & P.* pp. 255 f., 485 f., *DB. s.v.* JUDAH.—*And in the South*] Heb. the "Negeb," *i.e.* the southern tract of Judah, which the term always denotes when printed in RV. with a capital S (see Gn. 12^{9} RV. *marg.*); this is another technical geographical designation, denoting "the undulating pasture country, which intervened between the hills (הָהָר), and the deserts which encompass the lower part of Palestine" (*S. & P.* 159 f.; *DB. s.v.* JUDAH).

The Heb. word *Negeb* is derived from a root preserved in Aram. and signifying *to be dry;* and the district so named, though not entirely unprovided with water, has, speaking generally, that character. The "negeb" or "dry land" of Palestine being on the South, the term acquired (comp. W. R. Smith, *OTJC.*[2] p. 326) the general sense of "south" (Gn. 13^{14}, &c.); but when provided with the art. it always (except Dan. 8^{9} $11^{5ff.}$) denotes the special locality just described. The cities reckoned as belonging to the Negeb are enumerated in Jos. 15^{21-32} (comp. the expression "cities of the South," Jer. 13^{19} 32^{44} 33^{13} Ob.[20]). The sites of many of these cities are uncertain, or unknown; but it is difficult not to think that Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 359 ff., is disposed unduly to extend the Southern limits of the Negeb. The term in its geographical sense occurs frequently, *e.g.* Gn. 20^{1} 24^{62} Nu. $13^{17.22.29}$ Jos. 10^{40} 11^{16} 15^{19} ('Achsah's request of Caleb, illustrating the general aridity of the region).

And on the sea-shore] cf. Jos. 9^{1}. The term is added for the purpose of embracing in the description the whole of the country between the Jordan and the Mediterranean Sea. But, no doubt, the part of the coast specially intended is that extending from the N. end of the Shephélah towards ʿAcco and the Ladder of Tyre.—*The land of the Canaanite*] 11^{30} Jos. 5^{1} 11^{3} 13^{4} appear to show that D and D² limited the term "Canaanite" to the inhabitants of the ʿArábah, and of the N. part of the Mediterranean coast: it seems probable, therefore, that the "land of the Canaanite" is intended here not to be

Digitized by Google

synonymous with the "land of Canaan" generally, but to be epexegetical of the preceding "sea-shore" (cf. Jos. 13^{4}).—*Lebanon*] included similarly, 11^{24} Jos. 1^{4} (D^{2}).—*Even unto the great river, the river Euphrates*]: the same ideal limit is assigned to the territory of Israel in 11^{24} Jos. 1^{4}, as also Gn. 15^{18} Ex. 23^{31} (both JE) 1 K. 5^{1} (4^{21}), cf. Is. 27^{12}.—8. *See, I have set the land before you*] *to set before* (נתן לפני), in this connexion, means *to place at the disposal of, to give over to*; it is a favourite expression in Dt., being used often of the *delivering up* of foes before any one (see below). The land is free for the occupation of the Israelites; and they are bidden to enter and take possession of it. *Which Jehovah sware, &c.*] the oath to the forefathers is referred to often in JE (Gn. 50^{24} Ex. 13$^{5.\,11}$ 32^{13} 33^{1} Nu. 11^{12} 14$^{16.\,23}$ 32^{11} c. 31$^{20f.\,23}$ 34^{4}), and with particular frequency by D (1^{35} 6$^{10.\,18.\,23}$ 7^{13} 8^{1} 9^{5} 10^{11} 11$^{9.\,21}$ 19^{8} 26$^{3.\,15}$ 28^{11} 30^{20} 31^{7}: cf. in D^{2} Jos. 1^{6} 5^{6} 21$^{41\,(43)f.}$; also Jud. 2^{1}). The promise is recorded Gn. 12^{7} 13$^{14f.}$ 15$^{18ff.}$ (Abraham); 26$^{3f.\,24}$ (Isaac); 28$^{13f.}$ (Jacob); the *oath* is specified expressly only Gn. 22$^{16f.}$, cf. 26$^{3f.}$ (both JE).—*And to their seed after them*] so 4^{37} 10^{15}, and often in P (Gn. 9^{9} 17$^{7.\,8.\,9.\,10.\,19}$ 35^{12} 48^{4} Ex. 28^{43} Nu. 25^{13}); also 1 S. 24^{22} 2 S. 7^{12} (= 1 Ch. 17^{11}). The addition emphasizes the perpetuity of a promise or injunction.

9–18. The appointment of officers to assist Moses in the labour of judging the people (see Ex. 18). The numbers of the Israelites were so great as to render it impossible for Moses to adjudicate personally upon all the differences arising among them: hence, at his suggestion, they consented to the selection of competent men out of all their tribes, who should relieve him as far as possible of this burden. In instituting these men to their office, he had impressed upon them the duty of equity and impartiality in the discharge of it. Moses' action in the

8. רְאֵה] *see!* slightly more emphatic than the more common הנה: cf. 1$^{21.\,24.\,31}$ 30^{15} Jos. 6^{2} 8^{1} (D^{2}); also Gn. 27^{27} 41^{41} Ez. 4^{15} *al.* As the imper., by long usage, came to be employed as a mere exclamation, it is here treated as indeclinable (in spite of לפניכם): so 4^{5} 11^{26} (the pl. רְאוּ, however, occurs similarly; *e.g.* Gn. 39^{14}).—נתן לפני] so 1^{21} 2$^{31.\,33.\,36}$ 7$^{2.\,23}$ 23^{15} 28$^{7.\,25}$ 31^{5}; elsewhere (in the sense of *delivering up before*) only Jos. 10^{12} 11^{6} (D^{2}) Jud. 11^{9} 1 K. 8^{46} (Deut.) Is. 41^{2}: cf. לפני alone in Gn. 13^{9} 20^{15} 34^{10} 47^{6}; also 24^{51} Jer. 40^{4}.

Digitized by Google

appointment of these officers is attributed in Ex. (18^{13-23}) to the advice of Jethro, who, however, is not referred to here, as the stress lies less on the originator of the suggestion than on the fact of the organization having been established by Moses, and on the need for it in the numbers of the people.

9. *And I spake*] the tense in the Heb. (וָאֹמַר) suggests rather strongly a date subsequent to the command described v.$^{6-8}$—or at least a date at the *close* of the sojourn at Ḥoreb—instead of (as required by the existing narrative of Ex.) a date *prior* to it, and indeed prior to the arrival at Ḥoreb (Ex. 18: cf. $19^{1.2}$); either, therefore, the retrospect was written at a time when the interval between Jethro's visit (Ex. 18) and the departure from Ḥoreb (Nu. 10^{33}) had so dwindled that both could be included in the expression "at that time," or, as is not improbable even on independent grounds (cf. Dillm. on Ex. 18; Klost. *Pent.* 138, 143; Bacon, *JBLit.* xii. 24), Ex. 18 stood once in JE beside Nu. 10^{29-36}, and was still read there by the author of Dt.—*At that time*] the same expression occurs frequently in the retrospects, $1^{16.18}$ 2^{34} $3^{4.8.12.18.21.23}$ 4^{14} 9^{20} $10^{1.8}$ (rather differently 5^{5}),—in c. 2–3, even with reference to occasions, which, if the discourse was delivered by Moses, must have happened less than six months previously (1^{3} compared with Nu. $20^{22ff.}$ 33^{38}).—*I am not able to bear you alone*] the *reference* is to the appointment of judicial assessors to assist Moses, Ex. 18^{24}; but the *expression* is borrowed from the terms of Moses' complaint in the narrative of the 70 elders, Nu. 11^{14} (לא אוכל אנכי לבדי לשאת את כל העם הזה). As has already been remarked, the same rather peculiar phenomenon may be noticed frequently in the retrospects.—**10.** *As the stars of heaven*] 10^{22}

9. וָאֹמַר can only be interpreted naturally as stating, if not the sequel to v.$^{6-8}$ (Dr. § 67), yet something either really or, from the point of view of the speaker, substantially contemporaneous with it (*ib.* § 75). Had the author intended to disconnect the incident here narrated from what precedes, so as to leave scope for its being anterior, we should have expected him to avoid the construction with וְ (see *ib.* § 76 *Obs.*), and to say בעת ההיא אמרתי or ואנכי אמרתי בעת ההיא. The cases in which וְ expresses a sequence in thought, not in time (Keil), are different (*ib.* § 75, 76), and do not afford a precedent for the interpretation of the present passage.—**10.** לָרֹב] "*in respect of* multitude": Anglicè, "*for* multitude." The לְ defines the *tertium comparationis;* so often, as Jud. 7^{12} Gn. 3^{22} לדעת *in respect of* knowing,

28^{62}: so in the promise (JE) Gn. 22^{17} 26^{4} Ex. 32^{13} (each time with "multiply"): cf. Gn. 15^{5}.—**11–12.** In order to remove any misapprehension as to the motive of his protestation (v.$^{9f.}$), Moses adds that it was not the increase of the people which prompted it (for this his only desire was to see continued indefinitely), but simply his inability to cope with the practical difficulties which their numbers occasioned.—**11.** *Jehovah, the God of your fathers, add to you the like of you a thousand times*] Moses' wish is expressed with characteristic generosity and largeness of heart (cf. Nu. 11^{29}). For the phrase employed, cf. 2 S. 24^{3}.—*The God of your fathers*] the title gives expression to the continuity of the relationship subsisting between Jehovah and His people: the God who now takes Israel under His care is the same who formerly showed His faithfulness to their ancestors, and was known of them. So Ex. $3^{13.16}$ Dt. 4^{1} Jos. 18^{3}: and with *thy* Dt. 1^{21} 6^{3} 12^{1} 27^{3}, *our* 26^{7}, *their* 29^{24} Jud. 2^{12}.—*As he promised* (lit. *spake*) *to you*] a standing formula in Dt. (1^{21} 6^{3} 9^{3} (cf. ^{28}) 10^{9} 11^{25} 12^{20} 15^{6} 18^{2} 26^{18} 27^{3} 29^{12}; cf. without ל 6^{19} 26^{19} 31^{3}), as of D^{2} in Jos. ($13^{14.33}$ 22^{4} $23^{5.10}$). The reference is to Gn. 12^{2} 22^{17} $26^{3.24}$.—**12.** *How can I bear alone?*] the verse repeats more emphatically the thought of v.^{9}, for the purpose of stating more distinctly the ground of Moses' proposal. —*Your cumbrance* (טָרְחֲכֶם)] cf. Is. 1^{14} הָיוּ עָלַי לָטֹרַח.—*Your burden* (מַשַּׂאֲכֶם)] cf. Nu. $11^{11.17}$ "the *burden* of this (the) people."—**13.** *Get you men* (that are) *wise, and understanding, and known*]

41^{19} לָרֹב, Ex. 24^{10} לָטֹהַר. Notice the fine rhythmical close produced here by the addition of לרב (which is not in itself necessary, and in a sentence such as Gn. 22^{17} would have been heavy and inelegant).—**11.** דבר לכם] *to promise* is the general sense of דִּבֶּר with לְ; comp., besides the passages quoted above, 1 K. $8^{24.25.26}$ Gn. 24^{7} 28^{15} Ex. 32^{34} *al.*—**13.** הבו לכם] lit. *give for yourselves, i.e.* provide for yourselves, get you; so Jos. 18^{4}. The לְ is the reflexive or "ethical" לְ, explained on v.^{7}, and used also (as there mentioned) with trans. verbs; comp. תְּנוּ לָכֶם Ex. 7^{9} Jos. 20^{2}. Similarly קְנֵה לְךָ, שִׂימוּ לָכֶם, קְחוּ לָכֶם, קַח לְךָ, עֲשֵׂה לְךָ, &c., Gn. $6^{14.21}$ Ex. 5^{11} Jud. 19^{30} Jer. 32^{7}, and often, esp. in the imp.: in other tenses, Dt. 2^{35} 3^{7} 7^{25} 9^{12} (from Ex. 32^{8}: often also elsewhere with עשה) ^{16} 10^{1b} 15^{8}, and in injunctions $16^{9.13.18.21.22}$ $17^{16.17.18}$ $19^{2.3.7.9}$ 20^{14} 22^{12} 27^{2}; cf. *Lex.* לְ **5 h.**—לשבטיכם] the לְ has a distributive force, *according to your tribes*, *tribe by tribe*: cf. Jos. $7^{14.16}$ 18^{9} 1 S. 10^{19} &c.—בראשיכם] the ב is the "Beth essentiæ,"—"will appoint them *as* your heads": cf. Nu. 36^{2} נתן בנחלה to give *as* an inheritance, Jos. 23^{4} Ps. 78^{55}; and see *Lex.* בְּ **I. 7.** The expression in v.^{15} is

Digitized by Google

"known," *i.e.* of proved character and ability (𝔙 quorum conversatio sit probata). In Ex. 18^{21} the choice is to be determined by the moral qualities of the men to be selected ("men of worth, fearers of God, men of faithfulness, hating unjust gain"): here, though the terms used (esp. "known") imply moral qualifications, the emphasis rests rather on their intellectual fitness for the post to which they are to be appointed. —**15**. Moses took action accordingly, and selected men suitable for the purpose.—*The heads of your tribes*] 5^{20}. The words are, however, omitted in 𝔊 (which has in place of them simply ἐξ ὑμῶν); and as they agree indifferently with v.$^{13. 15}$ (according to which, not heads of the tribes, as such, but men of discretion selected from each tribe indiscriminately, were to be chosen), Dillm. may be right in supposing them to be a gloss. Otherwise it must be supposed that the men who approved themselves to Moses' choice were also those who were already distinguished as the leading representatives of their tribes.—*And made them heads over you, captains of thousands, &c.*] exactly as Ex. 18^{25} (see the Table, p. 10).—*And officers according to your tribes*] the duties and position of the "officers" (*Shoṭerim*) are not distinctly indicated.

In Arab. *saṭara* is *to rule* (a book), *to write; saṭr* is *a row* (of buildings, trees, &c.), *a line* (of writing). The primary sense of the root seems thus to have been *to range in order* (Nöldeke, *Gesch. d. Qorans*, p. 13); and *Shoṭer* will have denoted properly *arranger, organizer* (cf מִשְׁטָר Job 38^{33}†, *ordered arrangement*, i.e. *rule*). *Shoṭerim* are named immediately after the "elders" of the people in Nu. 11^{16} Dt. 29$^{9\,(10)}$ 31^{28} Jos. 8^{33} 23^{2} 24^{1}, by the side of the "judges" in Jos. 8^{33} 23^{2} 24^{1} Dt. 16^{18}; cf. Pr. 6^{7} (the ant has no קצין שׁטר ומשׁל): the duty of making proclamations or conveying orders to the people in time of war is assigned to them (Dt. 20$^{5. 8. 9}$ Jos. 1^{10} 3^{2}): in Egypt the officials appointed by Pharaoh's taskmasters for the purpose of superintending the labour of the Israelites bear the same name (Ex. 5$^{6. 10. 14. 15. 19}$). In the late passages 1 Ch. 23^{4} 26^{29} 27^{1} 2 Ch. 19^{11} 26^{11} 34^{13} the term appears likewise to be used of subordinate military or judicial officials, who once (2 Ch. 34^{13}) took part in superintending the repairs of the Temple. 𝔊 in Ex. 18$^{21. 25}$ Dt. 1^{15} 16^{18} 29$^{9\,(10)}$ 31^{28} renders by the curious term —perhaps the title of some law-officer at Alexandria—γραμματοεισαγωγεύς.

The *Shoṭerim*, it thus seems, were subordinate officials, who were employed partly in the administration of justice, partly in the maintenance of civil order and of military discipline, and

different.—**14.** טוב הדבר] the same formula of approval (though without a

Digitized by Google

whose duty it was to put in force the mandates issued by their superiors. Except here and Ex. 18^{25} the "captain of ten" is not mentioned in the OT.: the captains of 50, 100, and 1000 are mentioned frequently in connexion with the army (*e.g.* 1 S. 8^{12} 17^{18} 22^{7} 2 K. $1^{9.11.13}$ Is. 3^{3}), though not elsewhere as concerned with the administration of justice. The passage does not state that the *whole* people was divided systematically into thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens, but only that chiefs commanding these numbers were appointed, who exercised judicial authority, not necessarily over those only who were under their immediate command, but over the people at large. Men were appointed with military rank, and entrusted for the time with a share in the administration of justice. The arrangements in later days seem to have been out of relation with this institution. See more fully on Ex. 18.

16. *And I charged your judges, &c.*] Moses availed himself of the occasion for the purpose of impressing upon the judges the duties of their office, viz. to hear all impartially, to decide fearlessly, and to refer cases too hard for themselves to him.—*Hear between your brethren*] *i.e.* listen patiently to all that is said on both sides.—*And judge righteously* (or *righteousness*)] cf. $16^{18.20}$.—*And his stranger*] *i.e.* the stranger who has to deal with him. The "stranger" (*Gêr*), or foreigner settled in Israel (see on 10^{19} and 14^{21}), is to have equal rights, in such matters, with the native Israelite (24^{17} 27^{19}, and elsewhere).—**17.** *Ye shall not respect persons in judgment*] cf. 16^{19}, where see note.—*For the judgment is God's*] it belongs to Him; you are acting in His name, and as His representatives (cf. Ex. $18^{15.16}$ 21^{6} 2 Ch. 19^{6}); and you must accordingly be superior to worldly considerations. *And the matter which is too hard for you ye shall bring unto me*] Ex. 18^{26} (cf.^{22}) את הדבר הקשה יביאון אל משה. The reference is probably to cases which were not provided for by existing regulations or precedents, or which were in some

rel. clause following) 1 K. $2^{38.42}$ 18^{24}.—**16.** שָׁפֹט] the *inf. abs.* with the force of the imperative: see G-K. § 113. 4^{b} (*a*).—**17.** לא תכירו פנים] הִכִּיר פָּנִים, lit. *to recognise the presence* or *person* of any one (*sc.* unjustly), as 16^{19} Pr. 24^{23} 28^{21}†. The more usual expression is נשא פנים.—כקטן כגדול תשמעון] כַּקָּטֹן כַּגָּדֹל is (implicitly) an accus. of manner (G-K. § 118. 5), defining the circumstances under which the hearing is to take place: lit. "ye shall hear

Digitized by Google

respect complicated, as opposed to such as could be decided readily by existing laws.—**18.** *And I commanded you at that time all the things which ye should do*] the reference (cf. 4^{14} $5^{28\,(31)}$) appears to be to Ex. 24^{3} (cf. v.$^{7b.\,8b}$ 21^{1}; also 18^{20}). The repeated *at that time* (cf. v.$^{9.\,16}$) seems intended to emphasize the fact that Moses, before the departure of the people from Ḥoreb (v.^{19}), had done all that was in his power to provide for their civic welfare.

19–28. Departure of the Israelites from Ḥoreb, and journey to Ḳadesh-barneaʽ. Mission of the spies. Disappointment of the people upon receiving their report.

Dt. 1^{23} . . . . Cf. Nu. 13^{2b}.
1^{24a} . . . . Nu. 13^{17} ועליתם אל ההר, ^{23} ויבאו עד נחל אשכל.
1^{25a} . . . . Nu. 13^{20} ולקחתם מפרי הארץ.
1^{25b} . . . . Nu. 13^{26} וישיבו אתם דבר.
1^{27} . . . . Cf. Nu. $14^{2b\text{-}3a}$.
1^{28b} . . . . Nu. 13^{28} הערים בצורות גדלות מאד וגם ילידי הענק ראינו שם.

19. *That great and terrible wilderness*] so 8^{15}, where it is further described as the abode of fiery serpents and scorpions,

(them), the like of the small (being) the like of the great" = "ye shall hear (them), *so that* the small *be* as the great"; in English idiom, "Ye shall hear the small and the great alike." On כְּ (properly, an undeveloped subst.) see more fully the luminous explanation of Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften*, i. p. 376 ff., or *ap.* Böttcher, *Lehrbuch der Hebr. Spr.* ii. p. 64 f.; more briefly G-K. § 118. 6; and *Lex. s.v.* כְּ, at the beginning, and **3.**—תשמעון] the more original form of the termination of the 2nd and 3rd pl. impf., preserved in classical Arabic (in the *indicative* mood), in Aramaic (usually), Ethiopic, and Phœnician, but in Hebrew only occurring sporadically (altogether 305 times in the OT.; the passages are enumerated by J. L. König, *Alttest. Studien*, i. (1839) p. 165 ff., and Böttcher, § 930), not, however, as an archaism (for those books in which it is most frequent are not, upon any view of their authorship, the most ancient), but as a more emphatic form than that in ordinary use, adapted to round off a sentence, and accordingly sometimes preferred in an elevated or rhetorical style. It is peculiarly frequent in Dt., occurring in it 56 times. In other books it occurs (*e.g.*) 12 times in Gn., 28 times in Ex. (9 times in the Laws, c. 20–23), never in Lev., 7 times in Nu., 9 times in Jos., 8 times each in Jud. and 1 S., 15 times in 1–2 K., 21 times in Is. 1–39, 16 times in Is. 40–66, 53 times in the Psalms (of which 15 are in Ps. 104), 23 times in Job.—תגורו] 18^{22}. The word is rare, and mostly poetical, occurring besides in prose only Nu. 22^{3} (JE) 1 S. 18^{15}.—כי המשפט לאלהים הוא] lit. "For the judgment, *it* is God's" = (Anglicè) "For the judgment is God's." See Dr. § 198; *Lex.* הוא **3 b.**—**19.** את־המדבר] את is used (very exceptionally) with הלך to denote the space traversed: so 2^{7}; cf. Nu. 13^{17} (עלה).

Digitized by Google

and as waterless (cf. also 32^{10} Jer. 2^{6}). The wilderness meant is the desert of et-Tih (cf. p. 4), between the Peninsula of Sinai and the S. border of Palestine. Modern travellers describe its barrenness and "blanched desolation."

Thus E. H. Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus* (1871), pp. 284–288, writes: "The desert of et-Tíh is a limestone plateau of irregular surface, the southern portion of which projects wedge-wise into the Sinaitic peninsula." The distance across from Suez to ʻAḳabah is about 150 miles, and from the southernmost part of the wedge just mentioned to Beershebaʻ, about 170 miles. "The surface of the plateau is an arid featureless waste, its monotony relieved only by a few isolated mountain groups, amongst which the most conspicuous are Jebels Yeleg, Ikhrimm, and Helál. It is drained for the most part by the Wády-el-ʻarísh, which takes its rise in the highest portion of the southern cliff [where the plateau approaches the mountains of the Sinaitic peninsula], and flows northwards towards the Mediterranean. . . . The country is nearly waterless, with the exception of a few springs situated in the larger wadys; but even here water can only be obtained by scraping small holes or pits (called *themáïl*) in the ground, and baling it out with the hand. All that is obtained by the process is a yellowish solution which baffles all attempts at filtering. . . . The ground is for the most part hard and unyielding, and is covered in many places with a carpet of small flints. . . . In spite of the utterly arid nature of the soil, a quantity of brown parched herbage is scattered over the surface, and affords excellent fuel for the camp-fire. During the greater part of the year this remains to all appearance burnt up and dead, but it bursts into sudden life with the spring and winter rains. . . . In the larger wadys, draining as they do so extensive an area, a very considerable amount of moisture infiltrates through the soil, producing much more vegetation than in the plains, and even here and there permitting cultivation."

As the Northern part of the plateau is reached, the character of the country changes, the soil becomes more fertile, the fields and terraces are covered with corn and vines, until finally the wilderness gives place to the "Negeb" (see p. 13) of Judah. "Waterless" (8^{15}), provided the expression be not interpreted with prosaic literalness, is substantially accurate; for though wells and springs (as stated above) are met with, the water is mostly scanty and poor, except after rain (cf. Robinson, i. pp. 179, 180, 182, 184, 189, &c.; Palmer, pp. 304, 319, 326, 342, 345): in the Wady Lussán, however, and especially to the N. of ʻAin Ḳadís, as the Negeb is approached, water becomes more abundant, and the remains of dams and other devices for irrigation are discernible in the wadys (Palmer, pp. 347, 350, 354, &c.).—*Which ye saw*] and so gained

Digitized by Google

a practical acquaintance with its character.—*By the way to the hill-country of the Amorites*] *i.e.* by the route leading across the desert to the S. of Palestine (on v.[7]): if a definite road be meant, perhaps one branching off from the Mount Se'ir Road (v.[2]) a little NW. of 'Aḳabah, and circling round the base of Jebel 'Araif en-Nāḳah (Trumbull, *K.-B.* pp. 80–3).—*Commanded us*] v.[7].

20–21. Upon their arrival at Ḳadesh, Moses bade the people proceed to take possession of their promised inheritance.—**20.** *Which Jehovah our God is giving to us*] *i.e.* is in course of giving us (viz. at the present moment). AV. *giveth* obscures the true force of the original. The phrase (attached mostly to *land* or *ground*) is extremely common in Dt.: 1[25] 2[29] 3[20] 4[40] 5[16] (=Ex. 20[12]), &c. (some 25 times); and followed by נחלה 4[21] 15[4] 20[16] 21[23] 24[4] 25[19] 26[1]. Comp. in D[2] Jos. 1[2. 11. 15].—**21.** *Jehovah thy God*] so upwards of 200 times in Dt.; in Jos. (D[2]) 1[9. 17] 9[9. 24]; in earlier books of the Pent., only Ex. 15[26] 20[2. 5. 7. 10. 12] 23[19] (=34[26]) 34[24] (all parts of JE showing affinity with Dt.: Intr. § 5). So *Jehovah your God* (v.[10]) occurs nearly 50 times in Dt., and 28 times in Jos., mostly, if not entirely, in passages belonging to D[2] (*e.g.* 13 times in c. 23). Both expressions occur occasionally in the other hist. books and the prophets, but very much less frequently than in Dt. and D[2]. Cf. on v.[6] ("J. *our* God"). *Thy . . . thee*] Israel is addressed in Dt. (1) in the 2nd pers. plur. (as in the preceding verses); (2) as a whole, collectively, in the 2nd pers. singular, as here, v.[31] 2[7. 18f. 24] and frequently; (3) in the persons of its individual members, also in the 2nd pers. sing., 4[9b] ("thy *children*") [25] 6[6f.] 13[6 (7). 9 (10)] 15[7ff. 12. 16] 22[1ff. 6] &c. In particular cases it may sometimes be uncertain whether the 2nd pers. sing. is to be understood as (2) or (3); but there seem to be clear instances in which it is intended as an appeal to the individual Israelite. The change (as here) from the plural to the singular (or *vice versa*) is very frequent, sometimes taking place even within the limits of a single sentence (1[31] 2[7. 24] 4[9-11. 19. 20. 23b. 25. 29. 34] 6[1f.] 8[1f.] 12[5. 7. 9] &c.).—*Neither be dismayed* (וְאַל תֵּחָת׃)] a word confined mostly to poetry, and the higher prose style; see below.

21. ראה] v.[8].—ואל תחת] so 31[8] Jos. 8[1] 10[25] Jer. 30[10] (=46[27]) Ez. 2[6] 3[9] (לא) Is. 51[7] (in all, ‖ (ו)אל(לא) תירא); Jos. 1[9] (‖ אל תערץ). In Hex. used only by D and D[2];

Digitized by Google

—22–25. The people, however, in the first instance proposed that spies should be sent out to reconnoitre the land, and report upon the best way of approaching it; and Moses agreed to the proposal.—22. *And ye came near unto me and said*] in Nu. $13^{1f.}$ Moses sends out the spies in consequence of a command received by him from God: here the initiative appears to be taken wholly by the people. The two representatives are capable of at least a formal reconciliation: the people, it might be supposed, having (as Dt. states) preferred their request, Moses refers it to God, who then gives it His sanction, at which point the narrative in Numbers opens. At the same time, the variation is a remarkable one; and in view of the fact that the retrospect follows consistently the narrative of JE, which is defective in Numbers for the beginning of the episode of the spies (for Nu. $13^{1\text{-}17a}$ belongs to P), it is highly probable that it follows it here also, and that the representation referring the proposal to the people (v.$^{22f.}$) is based upon the narrative of JE, which the writer of Dt. had still before him intact.—23. *Twelve men, one man for every tribe*] Nu. $13^{1\text{-}16}$ (P). In the existing narrative of Nu. 13, the appointment of one spy from each of the tribes is recorded only in P; but it is probable that JE, when complete, described the selection similarly, and that this, as in other cases, is the source of the representation in Dt. *Tribe* is denoted in Dt. by שֵׁבֶט, which is used also by JE, not by P's characteristic term מַטֶּה (Nu. 13^2; *L.O.T.* p. 127).—24. *And went up into the mountain*] or *hill-country, i.e.* the high ground of Judah (v.$^{7.\,19}$). Cf. Nu. 13^{17}.—*Unto the torrent-valley* (2^{13}) *of Eshcol*] near Ḥebron (Nu. $13^{22.\,23}$).—25. *And they took of the fruit of the land, &c.*] Nu. $13^{23f.\,26b.\,27}$.—26–28. But in spite of the favourable report of the spies, the people refused to move, and murmured discontentedly in their tents.—26. *But ye would*

elsewhere, in prose, only 1 S. 17^{11}, and, as reminiscences of Dt., 1 Ch. 22^{13} 28^{20} 2 Ch. $20^{15.\,17}$ 32^7 (in all, ‖ (ואל תירא(ו)).—22. את הדרך] most probably the accus. is attached loosely to וישיבו אתנו דבר, κατὰ σύνεσιν: cf. G-K. § 117. 1 R.^{7}; *Lex.* 1 את 1 c, 3 α.—26. ולא אביתם) a favourite word in Dt.: 2^{30} 10^{10} 23^6 (Jos. 24^{10}) 25^7 29^{19}; 13^9 (לא תאבה לו).—ותמרו את פי י׳) 1^{43} 9^{23} Jos. 1^{18} (D^2) 1 S. 12^{14} (Deut.)†; the same idiom, in Qal, Nu. 20^{24} (P) 27^{14} (P) 1 S. 12^{15} 1 K. $13^{21.\,26}$ Lam. 1^8†; כמרים הייתם עם י׳ Dt. $9^{7.\,24}$ 31^{17}†. The word signifies *to resist*

Digitized by Google

not go up, and defied the mouth (*commandment*) *of Jehovah your God*] cf. Nu. 14^{3-4}; and see below.—**27.** *And ye murmured in your tents* (באהליכם)] hence Ps. 106^{25}. Geiger, *Urschrift* (1857), p. 290 f., supposed that באהליכם was an intentional alteration of באלהיכם *against your God*, made for the purpose of removing a statement disparaging to Israel: but the supposition is unnecessary; *in your tents* means "among yourselves," and suggests at the same time the reproach that the people refused to bestir themselves, and advance to the conquest of Canaan. —*Through Jehovah's hating us, &c.*] cf. 9^{28b}.—*To deliver us, &c.*] Jos. 7^7.—*The Amorite*] v.^{7}.—**28.** *Whither are we going up?*] *i.e.* to a land full of what unknown perils?—*Our brethren have caused our heart to melt*] the idiom as 20^8 Jos. 2^{11} 5^1 7^5 (all D^2); also, with reference to the same incident, Jos. 14^8 (Caleb speaks) ואחי אשר עלו עמי הִמְסִיו את־לב העם. The expression in Jos. 14^8 may be borrowed from here; but it is possible that in both passages it is derived from a part of JE's original narrative of the spies, not retained in Nu. 13.—*A people greater and taller than we* (עם גדול ורם ממנו)] rhetorically varied from Nu. $13^{28a.31}$: the phrasing is that of D (cf. $2^{10.21}$ 4^{38} 7^1 *end* $9^{1.2a}$ 11^{23}).—*Cities great and fenced into heaven*] so 9^{1b}. Varied from Nu. 13^{28} והערים בצורות גדלות מאד. Cf. Sayce, *Monuments*, p. 288 (Lachish).—*And, moreover, we have seen sons of the 'Anaḳim there*] as Nu. 13^{28}, except that יְלִדֵי הָעֲנָק "children of the 'Anāḳ" (collect.) is changed into בני ענקים (so 9^{2a}).

The three ילדי הענק, Sheshai, Aḥiman, and Talmai, who dwelt in Ḥebron, and were expelled by Caleb, are named in JE, Nu. 13^{22} Jos. 15^{14b}; בני ענק are mentioned in Nu. 13^{33} ("of the Nephilim"), Dt. 9^{2b}; בני הענק ("sons of the 'Anāḳ") in Jos. 15^{14a} (=Jud. 1^{20b}); בני ענקים in Dt. 1^{28} 9^{2a}; the more general designation (ה)ענקים occurs Dt. $2^{10.11.21}$ (in a comparison), and Jos. 11^{21-22} (D^2), where it is stated that they were cut off by Joshua out of Ḥebron, Debir, 'Anāḳ, and all the hill-country of Judah and Israel, and left only in the Philistine cities of Gaza, Gath, and Ashdod (cf. Jer. 47^{5b} 𝔊 (see Graf); also the Philistine ילדי הרפה 2 S. $21^{16.18}$ (cf. v.$^{20.22}$), and Goliath, the giant of Gath). In Jos. 14^{15} (JE or D^2) Arba' (whence the old name of

---

contumaciously, to defy or (intrans.) *be defiant.*—**27.** בשנאת י' אתנו] G-K. § 115. 2 R.^{1}: cf. 7^8 9^{28} Gn. 29^{20}.—להשמירנו] נשמר השמיד is a favourite word with D (27 times); elsewhere in the Hex only Gn. 34^{30} (J) Lev. 26^{30} Nu. 33^{52} (both H) Dt. 33^{27} (the Blessing); Jos. 7^{12} 9^{24} $11^{14.20}$ 23^{15} (mostly D^2) 24^8 (E).—**28.** בשמים] *in* heaven: so 9^1, cf. Gn. 11^4 וראשו בשמים. שמים, not of any far distant region, but of the heights of the air, in which, for instance,

Digitized by Google

Ḥebron, *Ḳiriath* (city of) *Arba'*) is described as האדם הגדול בענקים; and in Jos. 15^{13} 21^{11} (P) he is called *the father of the 'Anāḳ*. Most of these passages (including the oldest) connect the 'Anāḳim only with Ḥebron: that they were spread generally over the hill-country of Judah and Israel is stated only in Jos. 11$^{21f.}$, which belongs to D^{2}, and may be one of the generalizations to which this Deuteronomic author is prone (*L.O.T.* pp. 97, 101). It is, however, implied that there were more "giants" in Ḥebron than the three, Sheshai, Aḥiman, and Talmai; and perhaps indeed these three names are meant as those, not of individuals, but of families or clans.

29–40. Moses' vain endeavour to reassure the people. Jehovah's oath that none of that generation, save Caleb, should enter the Promised Land. Designation of Joshua, as Moses' successor.

Dt. 1^{30a} . . . . (Ex. 13^{21} ויהוה הולך לפניהם; 14^{14} יהוה ילחם לכם.)
1^{32} . . . . Cf. Nu. 14^{11b}.
1^{33} . . . . (Ex. 13^{21} ויהוה הולך לפניהם יומם בעמוד ענן לַנְחֹתָם הדרך ולילה בעמוד אש להאיר להם.
Nu. 14^{14b} ובעמוד ענן אתה הולך לפניהם יומם ובעמוד אש לילה.)
1^{33a} . . . . (Nu. 10^{33b} לתור להם מנוחה.)
1$^{35-36}$ . . . Nu. 14$^{23-24}$ אם יראו את הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאבותם . . . ועבדי כלב עקב היתה רוח אחרת עמו וימלא אחרי והביאתיו אל הארץ אשר בא שמה
1$^{37-38}$ . . . * * *
1^{39a} (om. 𝔊) Nu. 14^{31} וטפכם אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה; cf. Nu. 14^{3} נשינו וטפנו יהיו לבז.
1^{40} . . . . Nu. 14^{25b} מחר פנו וסעו לכם המדבר דרך ים סוף.

29–33. Moses encouraged the people by reminding them Who it was that went before them, and what He had done for them in the past.—**29.** *Dread not*] ערץ, as 7^{21} 20^{3} 31^{6a} Jos. 1^{9} (D^{2}). Not elsewhere in prose, and not frequent even in poetry.—**30.** *Who goeth before you*] 31$^{6b. 8}$; see Ex. 13^{21} (JE). —*Will fight for you*] Ex. 14^{14} (JE); also Ex. 14^{25} Dt. 3^{22} Jos. 10$^{14b. 42}$ 23$^{3. 10}$ (all D^{2}).—*Before your eyes*] a point which the Writer loves to emphasize (in different connexions) 4$^{6. 34}$ 6^{22} 9^{17} 25$^{3. 9}$ 28^{31} 29^{1} 31^{7} 34^{12}: cf. Jos. 10^{12} 24^{17} (both D^{2}) 1 S. 12^{16}. (The expression is also charact. of Ezek.) "Omitted here by 𝔊, evidently because Moses is addressing the new generation; but in v.$^{22ff.}$, and indeed through the entire discourse, the present generation is conceived by the speaker as identical with the past" (Dillm.).—**31.** *Which thou sawest*] v.^{19}.—*As a*

the birds fly (4^{17} Pr. 30^{19}).—**30.** הוא ילחם לכם] on the emphatic resumptive הוא, see Dr. § 123 *Obs.*; *Lex.* הוא **2 a.**—עשה אתכם] for "to do *with*," cf. 10^{21} 1 S. 12^{7b}; Jud. 11^{27}.—**31.** אשר נשאך] "*where* J. bare thee." After a word denoting place, time, or manner, the pron. or adv. complement of אשר (בו,

man doth bear his son] comp. for the simile 1^{44} 8^{5} (כאשר ייסר איש את בנו) $28^{29.\,49}$. The use of similes is not unfrequent in the more picturesque style of Hebrew prose (*e.g.* Ex. 33^{11} Nu. 11^{12} 22^{4} 27^{17} Jud. 6^{5} 7^{12} 14^{6} 15^{14} 16^{9} 2 S. $14^{17.\,20}$ $17^{8.\,10.\,11.\,13}$ &c.): those occurring in Dt. have been strangely supposed to be a mark of the Mosaic authorship of the book. For the thought of Jehovah's "bearing" His people, comp. Ex. 19^{4} ("on eagles' wings"); Dt. 32^{11} (the Song); also Hos. 11^{8} Is. $46^{3f.}$. —*Even unto this place*] 9^{7} 11^{5}; (אל) 26^{9} 29^{6}.—**32–33.** But in spite of this word of encouragement the Israelites remained disbelieving (cf. Nu. 14^{11}).—*In this thing* (RV.)] rather *in spite of this word* (*i.e.* of Moses' speech, just ended): the ב as Lev. 26^{27} Nu. 14^{11} בכל האותות *for* (i.e. *in spite of*) all the signs, Ps. 27^{3}.—*Ye continued not believing* (אינכם מאמינים)] the ptcp. with אין indicates the *endurance* of the state of unbelief (cf. מַמְרִים הֱיִיתֶם 9^{24}).—**33.** *Which went before you, &c.*] resumed from v.^{30a}, and further developed ("to spy out for you a place," &c.) for the purpose of marking more emphatically the gravity of the unbelief.—*To spy out for you, &c.* (לתור לכם וג')] apparently a reminiscence of Nu. 10^{33} (of the ark) לתור להם מנוחה. The rest of the verse consists of reminiscences, with slight variations, of Ex. 13^{21} and Nu. 14^{14} (quoted in the Table), לַחֲנֹתְכֶם being perhaps suggested by לַנְחֹתָם (Ex. 13^{21}), and לַרְאֹתְכֶם בַּדֶּרֶךְ ("to cause you to look upon the way") being seemingly a paraphrase of לְהָאִיר לָהֶם ("to give them light").

34–36. Jehovah's wrath; and His oath sentencing all the men of that generation, with the exception of Caleb, to exclusion from the Promised Land. Cf. Nu. $14^{22\text{-}24}$.—**34.** *Was wroth* (קצף)] Gn. 40^{2} Ex. 16^{20} 1 S. 29^{4} *al.*: of God, c. $9^{7.\,8.\,19.\,22}$ Is. 47^{6} $57^{16.\,17}$ *al.*—**35.** *Surely there shall not one of these men,* (even) *this evil generation, see, &c.*] a terse and forcible condensation of the terms of the oath contained in Nu. $14^{22f.}$ (comp. esp. v.^{23a}).—(Even) *this evil generation*] these words correspond to

or שָׁם) is often dispensed with, so that אשר alone becomes equivalent to *where, when, how* (*Lex.* אשר **4 b**; or on 1 S. 24^{5}).—כאשר ישא] the impf., denoting custom or habit, is the tense regularly used in comparisons; cf. v.^{44} Is. 29^{8} 65^{8} &c. (Dr. § 33*b*; G-K. § 107. 2*b*).—**33.** לראותכם] contracted for להראותכם (G-K. § 53. 3 R.^{7}; or on 1 S. 2^{28}). The contraction is, however, unusual; and perhaps לִרְאוֹתְכֶם *that ye might look* was meant by the writer.

Digitized by Google

nothing in Nu. 14, they are not expressed in 𝔊, and, by the somewhat awkward apposition which they form, they impede the flow of the sentence; hence they are perhaps a gloss, added (as Dillm. suggests) for the purpose of precluding the misconception that "these men" referred solely to the spies.—*The good land*] so often in Dt.: 3^{25} $4^{21.22}$ 6^{18} 8^{10} 9^{6} 11^{17}; Jos. 23^{16} (D²), and with *ground* (ארמה), *ib.* v.[13. 15]: cf. *a good land*, c. 8^{7} Ex. 3^{8} (JE).—**36.** *Save Caleb, the son of Jephunneh*] only in favour of Caleb was an exception made: see Nu. 14^{24}. The representation, according to which Caleb alone is directly mentioned as exempted from the sentence, agrees with that of JE (Nu. 14^{24}), as against that of P (Nu. 14^{30}), according to which Joshua is named together with Caleb (cf. *L.O.T.* pp. 58, 77, 103).—*Which he hath trodden upon* (דָּרַךְ)] Nu. 14^{24} has simply "whither he came"; Dt., in harmony with its more elevated style, uses the choicer and more expressive word ($11^{24.25}$ Jos. 1^{3} 14^{9}). The reference is specially to Hebron (Jos. $14^{12a.13.14}$).—*Hath gone fully after Jehovah*] so Nu. 14^{24}.

37–38. *Also with me was Jehovah angered on your account, saying, Thou also shalt not go in thither*] Moses *also* (as well as the rest) incurred God's anger, and was included consequently in the same sentence: another leader, Joshua, should bring Israel into its promised inheritance. The reference is generally supposed to be to Moses' act of presumption in striking the rock, Nu. 20^{10-11} (P), which, according to P (both *ib.* v.[12] and $27^{13f.}$ Dt. $32^{50f.}$), was the occasion of his exclusion from Canaan. Two independent grounds, however, each confirming the other, combine to render this view improbable.

(1) The *position* of the two verses, in the midst of a continuous narrative of what happened at Ḳadesh in the second year of the Exodus. Moses' act of presumption, narrated in Nu. 20, took place in the 39th year of the Exodus, some 37 years after the incident of the spies; and though it is true, as Keil observes, that the object of the retrospect is not to teach the people chronology and history, still the order followed in it *is* chronological, v.[39] carries on the thread of v.[35-36], and v.[37-38] are in no way marked, either by

—**36.** וולתי) 4^{12} Jos. 11^{13}. Not elsewhere in the Hex.—ולבניו] on the position of this word, see *Samuel*, p. 292, and on 1 S. 6^{11}.—מִלֵּא אחרי] lit. *to fill up after*, pregn. for *to go fully after, to follow with undivided allegiance.* Repeated from Nu. 14^{24} (JE), here and Nu. $32^{11.12}$ Jos. $14^{8.9.14}$. Only once besides, 1 K. 11^{6} לא כלא אחרי י׳ כרור אביו.

Digitized by Google

their form or by their contents, as parenthetical, or as referring to an occasion that took place 37 years subsequently; hence a strong presumption arises that they allude, like the context, to what occurred immediately after the return of the spies. (2) The expression "was angry with me *on your account*" (comp. the synonyms in the parallel notices 3^{26} 4^{21}) is very insufficiently explained, if the allusion be to the incident narrated in Nu. 20^{10-13}. By those who suppose this to be the case, the expression is accounted for by the fact that the sin of Moses was occasioned by the unbelief of the people; but the terms used imply naturally that God's anger with Moses was an immediate consequence of the people's misbehaviour, not that it only resulted from it, accidentally and indirectly, through the intervening cause of *Moses' own sin:* it is singular, if Nu. 20^{10-13} be the occasion referred to, that Moses' own fault should be unnoticed, and that each time, 3^{26} 4^{21} as well as here, it should be emphatically said that Moses incurred Jehovah's displeasure *on account of the people.* But this expression would be exactly explained if it could be supposed to describe how Moses had been implicated in the consequences of the people's disobedience after the return of the spies,—for instance, through his being included formally, in spite of the fact that he was personally innocent, in the terms of the sentence passed upon the disobedient Israelites.

Dillm., observing that v.^{39} is the natural sequel of v.^{36} (rather than of v.^{38}), and considering that the direction for Joshua's appointment is first given, according to Dt., in 3^{28}, supposes the verses to be an insertion in the original text of Dt., made by the Redactor, on the basis of $3^{26.28}$, for the purpose of supplying a notice, which seemed to be here desiderated, of Joshua's exemption from the sentence of exclusion from Canaan. This hypothesis meets the first of the two difficulties mentioned above, but leaves the second as it was.

It thus appears that, as they stand, neither the position of these two verses, nor their contents, can be properly explained unless they are held to refer to some incident which took place immediately after the return of the spies. If that be the case they will present another (cf. v.^{36}) of the many examples which the Pent. contains of a *double* tradition: according to Dt. Moses was forbidden to enter Canaan in consequence of the people's disobedience at Ḳadesh in the second year of the Exodus; according to P (Nu. 20^{12} $27^{13f.}$ Dt. $32^{50f.}$) it was on account of his presumption at the same spot, but on a different occasion, 37 years afterwards.—**37.** *Was angered* (הִתְאַנַּף)] 4^{21} $9^{8.20}$ 1 K. 11^{9} 2 K. 17^{18} (both Deut.).† An uncommon and forcible word. —*On your account* (בִּגְלַלְכֶם)] the force of בגלל may be learnt from Gn. 12^{13} 30^{27} 39^{5}: cf. the synonyms in 3^{26} (לְמַעַנְכֶם) 4^{21} (על דִּבְרֵיכֶם).—*Thou also*] including Moses in the same sentence with

Digitized by Google

the rest.—**38.** *Who standeth before thee* (הָעֹמֵד לְפָנֶיךָ)] *to stand before*, in Heb. idiom, is to *wait* or *attend upon*, as a servant, courtier, &c. (1 K. 10[8]; cf. on 10[8]). The phrase employed here is a synonym of the term used elsewhere of Joshua, מְשָׁרֵת מֹשֶׁה "Moses' minister" (Ex. 24[13] 33[11] Nu. 11[28] Jos. 1[1]†).—*He shall go in thither, &c.*] in accordance with the representation which connected Moses' exclusion from Canaan with the people's disobedience after the return of the spies, the nomination of Joshua as his successor is assigned to the same time: in P this is referred consistently to an occasion (Nu. 27[15-23]) arising directly out of Moses' presumption at the waters of Meribah (Nu. 27[12-14]), 37–38 years afterwards.

39–40. Only the next generation of Israelites shall enter the Promised Land.—**39.** *And your little ones, which ye said should be a prey*] in verbal agreement with Nu. 14[31], which in its turn is based upon Nu. 14[3] (JE) "our wives and our little ones shall be a prey," with the omission (from the nature of the case) of "our wives." The clause cannot be cited as an example of the retrospect presupposing the narrative of P; for the verses Nu. 14[31-32] (cf. B. W. Bacon, *The Triple Tradition of the Exodus*, p. 188) are referred most probably to JE (attaching originally to v.[24]): it is, moreover, remarkable that it is not expressed by 𝔊, and as "little ones" is almost tautologous by the side of "children" following, it is very possible that it is a comparatively late insertion from Nu. 14[31] (so Kuen. *Theol. T.* xi. 557 f., Dillm.).—*Who this day know not good or evil*] cf. Is. 7[15. 16]. Here the meaning is, who are morally irresponsible, and consequently no parties in the guilt of their fathers.—**40.** *But as for you, turn you, and take your journey into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea*] almost exactly as Nu. 14[25] (see the Table). Whether a definite road is meant, is uncertain; Trumbull identifies the "Red Sea Road" with the modern pilgrim track across the Tih from Suez to ʿAkabah (*Kadesh-Barnea*, pp. 81, 134, 360 f.).

38a. הוא) as v.[30]. So v.[30] הֵמָּה.—אתו חַזֵּק] notice the emph. position of the pron.; cf. 10[20] אתו תעבד ובו תשבע Jos. 5[7] Gn. 37[4] 42[36] Jud. 14[3] 1 S. 15[1] 18[17]; and similarly with preps., as Gn. 15[3] 30[16] 43[16] Ex. 21[8] 1 S. 19[20] 2 K. 5[11].—חַזֵּק] *strengthen, encourage:* 3[28], cf. Is. 41[7].—**40.** פנו לכם] v.[7].—

Digitized by Google

41–46. Ineffectual attempt of the people to force a way into the mountains of the Amorites. Their subsequent sojourn at Ḳadesh.

Dt. 1^{41a} . . . . Nu. 14^{40b} הננו ועלינו אל המקום אשר אמר י׳ כי חטאנו.
1^{42} . . . . Nu. 14^{42} אל תעלו כי אין י׳ בקרבכם ולא תנגפו לפני איביכם.
1^{43b} . . . . Nu. 14^{41} למה זה אתם עברים את פי י׳, ^{44} ויעפילו לעלות אל ראש ההר.
1^{44} . . . . Nu. 14^{45} וירד העמלקי והכנעני הישב בהר ההוא ויכום ויכתום עד החרמה.
1^{46a} . . . . (Nu. 20^{1} וישב העם בקדש.)

41. *We have sinned against Jehovah: we* (emph.) *will go up and fight, &c.*] *we* (אנחנו) will go up—not our descendants—and perform all that Jehovah requires of us. Cf. Nu. 14^{40b}. Notice how the retrospect passes from Nu. 14^{25} to Nu. 14^{40}, without any reference to v.$^{26-39}$, which belongs, in the main, to P.—*Go up*] as v.^{21}.—*Deemed it a light thing to go up*] *i.e.* went up heedlessly, attempted it as something to be lightly undertaken.—**42.** *Go not up, &c.*] the terms of the prohibition are taken nearly verbally from Nu. 14^{42} (see the Table), though it is not there expressly described as proceeding from God.—*Among you* (בקרבכם)] cf. Ex. 17^{7} 34^{9} Nu. 11^{20} $14^{14.42}$ Dt. 31^{17} Jos. 3^{10}. The same thought also in P, but always there expressed by the syn. בתוך Ex. 29^{45} Lev. $26^{11.12}$ (H) Nu. 5^{3} 16^{3} 35^{34}.—**43.** *But ye defied the mouth of Jehovah, &c.*] Nu. $14^{41.44}$.—**44.** And the Amorite, *who dwelt in that hill-country*, came forth . . . *and beat* you *down* in Se'ir *even unto Ḥormah*] the italicised words, as Nu. 14^{45}.—*The Amorite*] in Nu. the foe is termed "the 'Amaleḳite and the Canaanite": the change is probably to be attributed to D's use of "Amorite" in v.$^{7.19.20.27}$.—*As bees do*] Ps. 118^{12}; Is. 7^{18}. An effective comparison: swarming about you, as pertinaciously, as ferociously, and as numerously as bees.—*Even unto Ḥormah*] the former name of

41. ותהינו] a ἅπ. λεγ., to be explained from the Arab. *hāna*, *to be light* or *easy*, conj. iv *to slight* (Qor. 22^{19}); hence in Hif. *to deal lightly* or *heedlessly* in respect of going up (constr. exactly as Nu. 14^{44} ויעפילו לעלות; G-K. § 114. 2 R.^{3}). The meaning of the word was unknown to the ancient translators, who accordingly merely conjectured from the context; 𝔊 *συναθροισθέντες*, Aq. *ὁμονοήσαντες*, 𝔙 instructi armis, 𝔗 *began* (שריתון), 𝔖 *incited yourselves* (אתרגנתון). The Rabb. Commentators derived it fancifully from הֵן, as though it meant *to say Lo!* (cf. Nu. 14^{40b} הִנֶּנּוּ=*here* we are); and Rashi paraphrases accordingly וַתֹּאמְרוּ הִנֶּנּוּ, whence AV. "were ready."

Digitized by Google

Ḥormah was Ẓephath (Jud. 1^{17}): the origin of the name Ḥormah is related *ib.*, and Nu. 21^3. According to one tradition it was so called because the Israelites under Moses, in fulfilment of a vow, devoted it to the *ḥérem* or ban (on 7^2); according to another tradition, it received its name somewhat later, when the tribes of Judah and Simeon devoted it similarly in the course of their conquests. Ḥormah is mentioned besides Jos. 12^4 15^{30} (a city of Judah, in the Negeb, on the border of Edom) 1 S. 30^{30}: Jos. 19^4 1 Ch. 4^{30} it is reckoned to Simeon. The site is uncertain. Es-Sebaita (Seetzen, iii. 44; Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, 374–380, cf. 512 f.), in a plain in the Wady-el-Abyaḍ, about 25 miles NNE. of ʿAin-Ḳadis (Ḳadesh), has been suggested. As Dillm. remarks, the situation would be suitable, though *Sebaita* does not correspond phonetically to Ẓephath (צְפַת), as it should do. The existing ruins of es-Sebaita date from Christian times. The town lay in the centre of a well-cultivated district; and the hills around show traces of former orchards, and terraces of vineyards. If this be the site of Ḥormah, the Israelites, on the occasion in question, will have attempted to force their way into Canaan by one of the passes about 30 miles N. of Ḳadesh,—probably, if the view of Seʿir taken below be the true one, the Wady Murreh, which runs from SW. to NE., and which would bring them towards es-Seer.—*In Seʿir*] cf. Jos. 11^{17} 12^7, where "mount Ḥalaḳ [or the bare mountain], that goeth up to Seʿir," is mentioned as part of the Southern limit of Canaan. Trumbull (*K.-B.* pp. 91–102) has made it probable that this is the elevated plain of es-Seer, N. of the Wady Feḳreh, which runs in a South-Westerly direction SW. of the Dead Sea, and forms the natural boundary line between Canaan and the mountains W. of the Wady-el-ʿArabah (the Jebel Muḳrāh). As Ḳadesh is described (Nu. 20^{16}) as on the border of Edom (Seʿir), if it be rightly placed at ʿAin-Ḳadis, the Edomite territory will not have been confined to the region E. of the ʿArábah, but will have embraced more or less of the mountainous district on the other side, to the S. and SE. of Judah. 𝔊𝔖𝔙 express "*from* Seʿir to Ḥormah" (משעיר for בשעיר), which, if the locality just suggested for "Seʿir"

Digitized by Google

be right, is probably the true reading: for, though the sense is not materially different, the combination "from . . . to" is common and natural (see below).—**45.** *And wept before Jehovah*] in penitence: Jud. 20^{23} (cf. 21^{2}) 2 K. 22^{19}.—*Nor gave ear* (האזין)] the word is common in poetry; but in prose it occurs besides only Ex. 15^{26} (‖ שמע ל), and in late authors (Ne. 9^{30} 2 Ch. 24^{19}).—**46.** *And ye abode in Ḳadesh*] the phrase refers here to the period immediately following the defeat at Ḥormah; but in Nu. 20^{1} (JE) it is used of the period just before the message sent by Israel to the Edomites, 38 years subsequently, craving permission to cross their territory, in order to reach the E. side of the Dead Sea. See further the next note but one.—*According to the days that ye abode there*] an example of the "idem per idem" idiom, often employed in the Semitic languages, when a writer is either unable or has no occasion to speak explicitly. Comp. $29^{15\,(16)}$ "how we passed through the midst of the nations through which ye passed," 1 S. 23^{13} "and they went about where they went about," 2 S. 15^{20} 2 K. 8^{1} Zech. 10^{8}. The idiom is copiously illustrated, especially from Arabic, by Lagarde in a note at the end of the *Psalterium Hieronymi* (1874), p. 156f., from whose examples some specimens are cited in the writer's note on 1 S. 23^{13}.—*Many days*] the same expression, applied here to the sojourn at Ḳadesh, is applied in 2^{1} to the wanderings about Edom. The expression is, however, a vague one, and need not necessarily in both passages designate a period of similar length. In 2^{1} (see note) it must denote a period of 37–38 years, so that, unless the present passage be inconsistent (Wellh. *Comp.* 110, 200) with $2^{1.\,14}$, it cannot here embrace more than a few months. In point of fact, however, two different representations of the course taken by the Israelites after the incident of the spies at Ḳadesh are to be

44. בשעיר] the substitution of ב for מ is palæographically casy; for the Heb. alphabet passed through a stage in which the two letters resembled each other far more closely than they do either in the archaic or in the modern square character, and the versions supply many instances of their being confused; *Samuel*, p. lxviii. מן . . . עד, as Jud. 11^{33} 2 S. 5^{25} *al.* משעיר is accepted by Kn., Kosters (*De Hist.-Beschouwing van den Deut.* p. 53), Köhler (*Bibl. Gesch. AT.s* i. 305), Dillm., Oettli.

Digitized by Google

found in the OT., which it seems impossible in some respects to harmonize.

According to JE in Numbers, the Israelites, after the incident of the spies, are commanded to "turn back into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea" (Nu. 14^{25}). Whether they did this, is not stated: after the defeat at Ḥormah (Nu. 14^{40-45}) we next read of them that they "abode in Ḳadesh" on the [western] border of Edom (Nu. $20^{1.16}$),—as seems clear, in the *fortieth* year of the Exodus; hence they send to crave permission to pass through the Edomite territory, which being refused, they turn aside, and proceed "by the way to the Red Sea," in order to "compass" the land of Edom on the south (20^{14-21} 21^{4}), and so to reach the wilderness on the E. of Moab (21^{13}). (Similarly Jud. 11^{16-18}, which is based evidently upon JE.) In Dt., after the repulse at Ḥormah (1^{41-45}), the Israelites, it is said, "abode in Ḳadesh" many days (1^{46}): after this, in obedience to the injunction of 1^{40} (Nu. 14^{25}), they "turn back to the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea," and "compass Mount Se'ir many days" (2^{1}), until at length they are told (2^{3}) that they have done this long enough, and are to "turn northward": accordingly, proceeding in this direction along the E. border of Edom, they arrive, 38 years after leaving Ḳadesh-barnea', at the torrent Zered, on the border of Moab ($2^{8.13.14}$).

These two narratives imply two different conceptions of Israel's wanderings. The rather remarkable use of the same phrases "abode in Ḳadesh," and "compassing" the land of Edom, to denote in the two narratives different periods of the 38 years (cf. p. 31, and on 2^{1}), is indeed, in itself, a literary peculiarity, which may be explained as before (pp. 10, 15, &c.); but in the present case the difference is more than a merely literary one. In estimating it, two alternatives have to be considered. (1) If the present narrative of JE in Numbers be *complete*, the 38 years in the wilderness will have been spent at Ḳadesh: nothing is said of the Israelites moving elsewhere; and the circuit round Edom (Nu. 21^{4}) will have taken place at the close of this period, merely in order to enable the Israelites to reach the E. side of Jordan. In this case the representation in Dt. $2^{1.14}$, according to which the 38 years of the wanderings are occupied entirely with circling about Mount Se'ir, will be irreconcilable with JE. (2) If it could be assumed that the narrative of JE between Nu. 14 and Nu. 20 is *incomplete*, and that it once told how the Israelites, after remaining—perhaps a few months—at Ḳadesh, afterwards wandered southwards, in obedience to the command, Nu. 14^{25}, then the sojourn at Ḳadesh, related by JE in Nu. 20^{1}, would be a *second* visit of the Israelites to the same place, after the wanderings in the wilderness had been completed, some 38 years after the first. The supposition that JE's narrative in Numbers has been preserved incompletely is not in the abstract an unreasonable one; and the assumption that Nu. 20^{1} speaks of a *second* visit of the Israelites to Ḳadesh has been generally made by commentators: but even so the two narratives do not harmonize; for although the silence of Dt. (in 2^{1}) would not in itself be conclusive against a second visit to Ḳadesh, such a visit appears to be inconsistent with 2^{14}, which alludes to the Israelites' departure from

Digitized by Google

Kadesh-Barnea', 38 years previously, in terms implying that they *had not visited it since*. Dt. $2^{1.14}$ thus supports the view that the Israelites visited Ḳadesh once only, and that Nu. 13–14 and Nu. 20 relate, respectively, the beginning and the close of one and the same sojourn there.

The discrepancy is acknowledged by Dillm., not less than by Wellh., and is attributed by him, no doubt rightly, to the fact that no fixed or distinct tradition existed respecting the journeyings of the Israelites in the wilderness. According to JE the 38 years in the wilderness were spent at Ḳadesh; according to Dt. they were spent *away* from Ḳadesh (2^{14}), in wandering about Edom (2^{1}). The discrepancy is lessened, though not removed, by the consideration that Ḳadesh was situated on the border of Edom (Nu. 20^{16}). The endeavour to solve it by the hypothesis that part of the Israelites remained in Ḳadesh, while the rest wandered in the wilderness with Moses (Schultz and others), as Dillm. observes, is inconsistent with the text of Dt.; in the Hebrew the pronouns are unexpressed, so that there is no antithesis between *ye* of 1^{40} and *we* of 2^{1} (cf. $29^{15(16)b}$, quoted on p. 31).

Dt. 2^{1a}	. . . . (Resumption of 1^{40}.)
2^{1b}	. . . . (Nu. 21^{4} דרך ים סוף לסבב את ארץ אדום.)
$2^{2\text{-}8a}$	. . . . * * *
2^{8b}	. . . . Cf. Nu. 21^{11}.
$2^{9\text{-}12}$	. . . . * * *
2^{13}	. . . . Cf. Nu. 21^{12}.
2^{14b}	. . . . Nu. 32^{13b} עד תם כל הדור.
$2^{18.24a}$	. . . . Cf. Nu. 21^{13} (the Arnon).

II. 1–8ª. How the Israelites, having turned back into the wilderness, and having spent much time in circling about Mount Se'ir, were at length directed to turn Northwards, so as to skirt the Eastern border of Edom.—*As Jehovah spake unto me*] 1^{40} Nu. 14^{25}.—*And we compassed the mountains of Se'ir* (1^{2}) *many days*] cf. Nu. 21^{4} (JE) " . . . by the way to the Red Sea, *to compass the land of Edom*" (viz. after permission to pass through the Edomite territory had been refused). There the expression is applied in its natural sense to the final passage of the Israelites round the S. of Edom; in Dt. it is applied differently to their wanderings during 37–38 years—for v.$^{7.14}$ show that this is what the "many days" must

Digitized by Google

embrace—about the W. and SW. borders of Edom (cf. Wellh. *Comp.* p. 200). (The supposition that the journey into the wilderness, 2^{1a}, includes the 37–38 years, and that the circuit of Mount Seʿir, 2^{1b}, is the same final stage that is referred to in Nu. 21^{4}, is hardly probable; for then the longer period would be passed by without any hint of its duration, while the few months at its beginning and end would each be characterized as "many days," 1^{46} 2^{1}.)—**3.** *Turn you northwards*] the Israelites must be imagined by this time to have made their way along the SW. and S. border of Edom, as far as the SE. end of the ʿArábah, so that a turn northwards would at once lead them along the E. border of Edom in the direction of Moab. —**4–7.** The Israelites, in crossing the Eastern frontier of the Edomites, were not to molest them in any way. The passage stands in no connexion with Nu. $20^{14\text{-}21}$, which narrates the application made by Israel from Ḳadesh, on the *Western* border of Edom, for permission to pass *through* the Edomite territory, which was refused. That incident belongs to an earlier stage of the Israelites' wanderings, and is not noticed in Dt.—**4.** *Your brethren*] cf. $23^{8(7)}$ Am. 1^{11} Ob. $^{10.\ 12}$ Mal. 1^{2}.—*Which dwell in Seʿir*] 1^{2}.—*Will be afraid of you*] the intentions of the Israelites being imperfectly known: cf. Nu. $20^{18\text{-}20}$.—*So take good heed* (ונשמרתם מאד)] on 4^{9}.—**5.** מדרך כף רגל] cf. 11^{24} Jos. 1^{3}.—**6.** *Ye shall purchase food, &c.*] the same spirit had been shown by the Israelites previously (Nu. $20^{17.\ 19}$); but it had failed to evoke a favourable response on the part of Edom.—**7.** They are able to treat Edom on these terms, inasmuch as God has abundantly blessed them, and even in the wilderness

II. 3. רב לכם] 1^{6}.—פנו לכם] 1^{7}.—**4.** עברים] *are passing*,—are on the point to pass. The ptcp. expresses the imminent future (the so-called *fut. instans*), as frequently, esp. in this book: cf. נֹתֵן *is* giving, $1^{20.\ 25}$ 2^{29} 3^{20} $4^{1.\ 8}$ 5^{16} &c. (Dr. § 135. 3).—בגבול] *through*, not *by* (על, or את v.^{18}): עבר ב as Nu. 20^{18} לא תעבר בי thou shalt not pass *through me* (*i.e.* through my territory), 21^{22} 1 S. 9^{4} &c.—**5.** אל תתגרו בם] גֵּרָה (Piel), with מָדוֹן, is *to excite* strife (Pr. 15^{18}); hence in the Hithp., with ב, *to excite oneself* against, *engage in strife with, provoke*: cf. v.$^{9.\ 19.\ 24}$ 2 K. 14^{10} fig. (see RV. *marg.*). —יְרֻשָּׁה] an uncommon word, mostly confined to D and D² (v.$^{9.\ 9.\ 12.\ 19.\ 19}$ 3^{20} Jos. 1^{15} $12^{6.\ 7}$): only besides Jud. 21^{17} Jer. 32^{8} Ps. 61^{6} 2 Ch. 20^{11}. The usual synon. is נַחֲלָה, or (in P) אֲחֻזָּה.—**6.** מֵאִתָּם] idiom. with verbs of buying: Gn. 17^{27} Jos. 24^{32} &c.—**7.** זה] used as an indeclin. adv. "*now, already*, forty

Digitized by Google

permitted them to lack nothing.—*Hath blessed thee*] the blessing of God, as resting upon His people, or promised to it, is frequently emphasized in Dt. (1^{11} 7^{13} 12^{7} $14^{24.29}$ $15^{4.6.10.14.18}$ $16^{10.15}$ 23^{21} 24^{19} $28^{8.12}$ 30^{16}, cf. 26^{15}); it is here affirmed, even for the years spent in the wilderness.—*The work of thy hand*] thy undertakings, enterprises,—a common Deut. expression (with "bless," as here, 14^{29} 16^{15} 24^{19} 28^{12}; also 30^{9}). Usually, as the context of the passages quoted shows, it has reference to the operations of agriculture (cf. Is. 65^{22} Hag. 2^{17} Job 1^{10}), but it is also used more generally (Hag. 2^{14} Ps. 90^{17}), and even in a bad sense (see on 4^{28} 31^{29}). (Differently, of the works of God, Ps. 19^{2} 28^{5} *al.*)—*Hath known thy walking, &c.*] i.e. ***hath taken notice of it***, concerned Himself about it: cf. the same verb in Gn. 39^{6} Ps. 1^{6} 31^{6} Pr. 27^{23}.

8^{a}. Accordingly, the Israelites ***passed by from the vicinity of*** (מֵאֵת) their ***brethren the children of 'Esau, away from the way of the 'Arábah, away from Elath and from 'Eẓion-Geber***, towards the wilderness of Moab. The 'Arábah is here, of course, the modern Wady-el-'Arabah (p. 3), S. of the Dead Sea; and the "way of the 'Arábah" is no doubt the road leading through it—still the route from 'Aḳabah to Ḥebron (*BR.* i. 198; cf. Hull, *Mount Seir*, pp. 75, 79, &c.), the part here particularly meant being its S. end, where, starting from 'Aḳabah on the Red Sea, it would (probably) pass shortly afterwards by 'Eẓion-Geber. The Israelites, turning off from the neighbourhood of 'Aḳabah, in a North-easterly direction, would naturally leave this "way of the 'Arábah," as well as Elath and 'Eẓion-Geber, behind them. The precise site of 'Eẓion-Geber is uncertain; but it must have lain on the Red Sea, very near (את) to Elath (1 K. 9^{26}, cf. 22^{49}): upon the supposition that the "mud flats," which now appear to constitute the lower end of the Wady-el-'Arabah (*DB.*^{2} i. 854*a*), were formerly covered by the sea, it was identified by Robinson (i. 169 f.), not improbably, with 'Ain-el-Ghuḍyan, some 15 miles

years": so $8^{2.4}$ Gn. 27^{36} &c. (*Lex.* זה **4h**).—**8.** מֵאֵת] *from beside, from proximity to*, Jos. 22^{9} Jer. 9^{1}.—**9.** מלחמה] acc., defining the *manner* in which the action of התגר takes place: "excite not thyself against them *as regards* (or *in*) *battle*" (G-K. § 118. 5). So v.^{24}.

Digitized by Google

N. of the present extremity of the Gulf. Elath, called by the Greeks and Romans Αἴλανα, *Aelana*, is frequently mentioned by classical writers: it is the modern ʿAḳabah (Rob. i. 171). The Israelites, after leaving Elath, may have ascended by the large and steep Wady-el-Ithm (Rob. i. 174; Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 523), which runs through the mountains in a NE. direction, and forms the main passage from ʿAḳabah to the Eastern desert; they would then join the road, corresponding to the route of the modern Syrian *Ḥaj* (pilgrimage) from Damascus to Mecca, at Maʿan, a little E. of Petra, and so would be on the way to their destination in the steppes of Moab.

8^b–15. How the Israelites, upon approaching the Moabite territory, were warned not to encroach upon it, and how they reached the torrent of Zered.—8^b. *The way to the wilderness of Moab*] *i.e.* to the great rolling plains of grass or scrub (Tristram, *Land of Moab*, pp. 148, 169), stretching out "before"—*i.e.* to the East of—"Moab" (Nu. 21^{11}) *Midbār*, "wilderness,"—properly a *driving-place* (for cattle),—denotes often an expanse of uncultivated pasture-ground, not necessarily a desert.—**9.** *The children of Loṭ*] Gn. 19^{37} Ps. 83^9.—*ʿAr*] v.$^{18.29}$ Nu. $21^{15.28}$ (cf. 22^{36}) Is. 15^1. The capital city of Moab, situate on its N. or NE. border (cf. v.^{18}), in the valley of the Arnon. Its exact site is uncertain: for a conjecture, see on v.^{36}. ʿAr is perhaps specified here, as being the point at which the Israelites would approach most closely the Moabite territory on their left (Dillm.): comp. on v.^{18}.

It is sometimes wrongly identified with Rabbah (probably through a confusion arising from the fact that Ἀρεόπολις, the name given by Jerome to ʿAr, is given to Rabbah by Eusebius). Rabbah, however, which lies almost in the centre of Moab, some 10 miles S. of the Arnon, does not answer to the Biblical description of ʿAr as situate on the "border" of Moab, and (cf. Nu. 22^{36}) on the Arnon (see Dietrich, in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 1869, p. 325 ff., Delitzsch on Is. 15^1, Dillm. on Nu. 21^{15}, and *HWB.*^{2} *s.v.*).

10–12. An antiquarian notice, relating to the previous occupants of the lands of Moab and Edom.—**10.** *The Emim dwelt therein aforetime*] cf. v.^{11} Gn. 14^5†, where the Emim are mentioned as dwelling in Shaveh-Ḳiriathaim, *i.e.* (probably) the plain of Ḳiriathaim, a city 5–6 miles N. of the Arnon (Nu.

Digitized by Google

32^{37} Jos. 13^{19}). The territory of Moab once extended N. of the Arnon (Nu. 21^{26}); and the Emim must have been the pre-historic population of this region, reputed to have been a powerful race, of giant stature, who were afterwards expelled by the immigrant Moabites, as the Ḥorites were expelled from Edom and the Canaanites from Palestine.—*As the ʿAnaḳim*] cited as the most familiar example of a giant race (1^{28}).—**11.** *They also, like the ʿAnaḳim, are counted as Rephaim*] *i.e.* the Emim were popularly spoken of as "Rephaim"; but the Moabites gave them the special name of "Emim." The Rephaim were a giant aboriginal race, inhabiting parts of Palestine, from whom (presumably) the names of certain localities were derived, and whose descendants—or reputed descendants—are alluded to in historical times.

They are named beside the Perizzites, Gn. 15^{20} Jos. 17^{15} (the precise region here meant is, however, uncertain): the "vale (עֵמֶק) of Rephaim," near Jerusalem, is mentioned Jos. 15^{8} 18^{16} 2 S. $5^{18. 22}$ 23^{13} Is. 17^{5}; 2 S. $21^{16. 18. 20. 22}$ various doughty warriors of Gath are described as "children of the Rapha" (ילידי הרפא), or as "born to the Rapha" ("the Rapha" being meant collectively = "the Rephaim"); here and v.[20] they are said to have dwelt once in the territory E. of the Dead Sea, occupied afterwards by the Moabites and the ʿAmmonites: 3^{11} (cf. [13]) Jos. 12^{4} 13^{12} ʿOg, king of Bashan, is described as "of the remnant of the Rephaim" (מיתר הרפאים); and Gn. 14^{5} the Rephaim in ʿAshteroth-Ḳarnaim are stated to have been smitten by Chedorlaʿomer. From these notices, it would seem that the Rephaim were specially associated with the region E. of Jordan, though traces of their former presence were also to be found here and there in Canaan as well.

12. *And in Seʿir dwelt the Ḥorites aforetime, &c.*] the Ḥorites were the primitive population of the hill-country of Seʿir, but were dispossessed by the descendants of ʿEsau. The note, though attached to the similar remark about the Moabites, is really intended as an antiquarian illustration of v.[5]. The Ḥorites are mentioned besides v.[22] Gn. 14^{6} 36^{20-30}.

11. יחשבו] *are* counted: the impf. with a frequentative force, of a custom: cf. v.[20] Gn. 10^{9} 22^{14} יֵאָמֵר *it is said* (*i.e.* it is *commonly* said), Ex. 13^{15} 18^{15} &c. (Dr. § 33*a*; G-K. § 107. 2).—אף הם] so v.[20] (אף היא): cf. 15^{17}, and (poet.) $33^{3. 20. 28}$. Except in the sense of *how much more* (or *less*), אף is very rare in ordinary prose (גם being the usual syn.; cf. 3^{20}): *v. Lex.*—**12.** יירשום] the impf. is unusual, but hardly (Dillm.) "impossible": cf. 2 S. 15^{37} 1 K. 7^{8b} 20^{33} 2 K. 13^{20} (Dr. §§ 27 *γ*, 85 *n*.). Lit. "*proceeded* to possess them."

Digitized by Google

The name חֹרִי means probably *cave-dweller*, *Troglodyte* (from חוֹר *hole*, Arab. *ḥawr*, *cave:* for another view, see Sayce, *Monuments*, p. 204); and high up in the rocks (cf. Ob.[3-4]), both those forming the amphitheatre in which Petra lies, and those lining the defiles by which it is approached, there are still to be seen innumerable caves and grottoes, hewn in the soft sandstone strata, the form and arrangements of which show that in most cases they were originally intended for habitations (*DB.*[1] *s.v.* EDOMITES). Jerome (*Comm.* on Ob.[6]) attests the habit of living in caves as prevalent in Edom in his day. The custom, originated by the primitive inhabitants of Edom, was suited no doubt to the physical character and climate ("propter nimios calores solis," Jerome) of the country, and was accordingly adhered to by those who succeeded them. For a description of the remarkable situation and antiquities of Petra, the ancient capital of Edom (the Heb. Sela', Jud. 1[36] 2 K. 14[7] Is. 16[1]), see Rob. *BR.* ii. 128 ff.; *S. & P.* p. 87 ff.; Bād. p. 183 ff.; Palmer, *Desert of the Ex.* p. 429 ff.; or Hull, *Mount Seir*, p. 85 ff.

As Israel did unto the land of his possession] the words could clearly not have been penned until after the Israelites had taken possession of Canaan. They cannot be referred (Keil *al.*) to the occupation of the trans-Jordanic territory by the 2½ tribes (Nu. 32); for the subject of the verb is "Israel," without qualification or restriction, so that the limitation suggested is not admissible.

13. *Now rise up, and get you over the torrent Zered*] the verse connects directly with v.[9]. The torrent Zered is named also in the fragment of E's itinerary preserved in Nu. 21[12ff.], as marking the station of the Israelites immediately before their passage of the Arnon. It has been often identified with the Wady-el-Aḥsa, which runs from the SE. into the S. end of the Dead Sea (Wetzstein in Del. *Gen.*[4] p. 567 f.; Tristram, *Moab*, p. 49 f.); but inasmuch as this must have formed the S. border of Moab on the side of Edom, and 'Iye-'abārim, the station *prior* to the torrent Zered, is described in Nu. 21[11] as being in the wilderness on the E. of Moab, some Wady further to the N. appears to be denoted by it,—either the Sail Sa'īdeh (Kn.), the principal confluent of the Arnon from the SE. (Fischer and Guthe's Map), or more probably, perhaps, the Wady Kerak (Ges. Hitz. Keil, Di.)—in the upper part of its course called the Wady-el-Franji—a deep and narrow gorge (Tristram, pp. 65–69) running past Kerak in a NW. direction into the Dead Sea. Arrived at this spot, the Israelites are directed to cross the Wady—with the implication, probably (cf. v.[18f.]), that

Digitized by Google

they are to advance straight forwards, without trespassing on the Moabite territory upon their left.—*Torrent* (נַחַל)] "brook" is not an adequate rendering; but נַחַל has, in fact, no proper English equivalent. The term which really corresponds is the Arabic *Wādy*, so frequently occurring in descriptions of travel in Palestine. נחל "signifies the hollow or valley of a mountain-torrent, which, while in rainy seasons it may fill the whole width of the depression, in summer is reduced to a mere brook, or thread of water, and is often entirely dry" (*S. & P.* App. § 38). *Naḥal* denotes indifferently the "torrent" or the "torrent-valley": thus 1 K. 17^{3} Elijah hides "in" the "torrent-valley" of Kerith, and v.[4] drinks of the "torrent" (the word in both verses being the same).—**14.** The journey from Ḳadesh-barnea' to the torrent Zered had been protracted for 38 years, until all the generation which had rebelled at Ḳadesh had passed away. The oath, as 1^{35} Nu. 14^{21-23} (JE).—*Until all the generation*, (even) *the men of war, were consumed*] cf. v.[16. 35] Nu. 32^{13} (JE) Jos. 5^{6} (D^2). By the addition "the men of war" the terms of the sentence are limited somewhat more distinctly than in 1^{35} Nu. 14^{21-23} to the adult males: comp. the still more precise limitation of P, Nu. 14^{29} 32^{11} (middle clause) "from 20 years old and upwards."—**15.** *Moreover Jehovah's hand was against them, &c.*] cf. Ex. 9^{3} Jud. 2^{15} 1 S. 5^{9} 7^{13} 12^{15}. Not natural causes only, but the special action of God's hand as well, co-operated to accomplish their destruction (cf. Nu. $16^{31f.}$ 21^{6} 25^{3-5} in JE).—*To discomfit them* (לְהֻמָּם) *from the midst of the camp*] or *rout them in confusion:* Ex. 14^{24} 23^{27} Dt. 7^{23} 1 S. 7^{10} Ps. $18^{15(14)}$.

16–25. How the Israelites, upon finding themselves in front of the 'Ammonites, were commanded not to molest them, but to cross the Arnon, and pass on to the territory of Siḥon.—To these verses nothing corresponds in the narrative of Numbers. —**18.** *To pass by the border of Moab,* (even) *'Ar*] it would seem, then, that 'Ar lay in the NE. corner of Moab, near the route

15. עַד־תֻּמָּם] $31^{24.30}$ Jos. 8^{24} 10^{20} Jer. 24^{10}, עַד־תֻּמּוֹ 1 K. 14^{10} (not all in the same application).—**16.** תַּמּוּ . . . לָמוּת] lit. "had ended . . . *in respect of* dying" = *had finished* dying (cf. Nu. 17^{28} Jos. 3^{17} *al.*): constr. as 1^{41}.—**18.** עֹבֵר] the ptcp., as v.[4]; cf. 3^{21} $4^{14.22}$ 6^{1} &c., $9^{4.5}$.

Digitized by Google

along which the Israelites would pass.—**19.** *In front of* (מוּל) *the children of 'Ammon*] the 'Ammonites occupied the territory between the Arnon on the S. and the Jabboḳ on the N., on the *East* of the district which was allotted afterwards to Reuben and Gad, but which, at the time of the Exodus, formed the dominion of Siḥon king of the Amorites (cf. Nu. 21^{24} [see Dillm.] Jud. 11^{13} [where the addition *unto Jordan* expresses the false claim preferred by the 'Ammonites against Jephthaḥ]). The Israelites, upon reaching the Arnon, would thus have the land of the 'Ammonites immediately in front of them: they were not, however, to trespass upon it, but, leaving it on their right, to pass on through the territory of Siḥon, king of Ḥeshbon.

20–23. An antiquarian notice (cf. $v.^{10-12}$), respecting the former occupants of the 'Ammonite territory. This also, like the land of Moab ($v.^{11}$), had once been inhabited by Rephaim, who were called, however, by the 'Ammonites *Zamzummim*. Of the Zamzummim (𝔊 Ζοχομμιν, cod. F. Ζομμειν) nothing is known beyond what is here stated, viz. that they were reputed to have been a giant race, dispossessed by the 'Ammonites: they have been supposed to be the same as the "Zuzim in Ham," who are mentioned (Gn. 14^5) between the "Rephaim in 'Ashteroth-Ḳarnaim" and the "Emim in Shaveh-Ḳiriathaim," and who therefore, apparently, had their home in a corresponding locality. For the expressions in $v.^{20-22}$, cf. $v.^{10-12}$.

The names Rephaim, Emim, and Zamzummim are all somewhat curious, and provoke speculation as to their possible origin and significance. Rephaim is also the Heb. (Is. 14^9 *al.*) and Phœnician (*CIS*. I. i. 3^8) name for the *shades*, or *ghosts* of the departed; אֵימָה is a Heb. word meaning *terror*; the Arab. *zamzamah* is *a distant, confused sound; zîzîm* is *the low or faint sound of the Jinn*, heard by night in the deserts (Lane, *Arab. Lex*. 1248–49). Prof. W. R. Smith writes (MS. note): "Antioch and the country about it also claimed to have been inhabited of old by giants (Malalas, ed. Bonn, p. 202). The giant-legends no doubt arose in part from the contemplation of ancient ruins of great works and supposed gigantic tombs; but I think that Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode* (1892), p. 64 f., is not wrong in supposing a connexion between רפאים *ghosts*, and רפאים *extinct giants*, and also in connecting אמים with אימה *terror*. So again Zamzummim are doubtless, as he says, *whisperers, murmurers*; and the name might have been illustrated by him from the Arabic *'azîf*, the eerie sound of the Jinn in the wilderness (Wellh. *Reste Arab. Heidentumes*,

Digitized by Google

p. 136). I take it that the old giants were still thought to haunt the ruins and deserts of East Canaan."

21. *Destroyed them from before them*] cf. Jos. 24^{8} Am. 2^{11} (where the same phrase is used of the Amorites destroyed before Israel).—*Even unto this day*] cf. on 3^{14}.—**23.** A further illustration of the manner in which, under God, an immigrant race might expel the previous possessors of a country. The *'Avvim* are mentioned elsewhere only Jos. $13^{3\text{-}4}$ (beside the Philistines); *Caphtor, i.e.* Crete,—or (Ebers, Sayce, *Races*, p. 53: see on Gn. 10^{14}) the coast-land of the Delta,—was the home of the Philistines (Am. 9^{7} Jer. 47^{4}). The verse thus states that the 'Avvim, the original occupants of SW. Palestine, were expelled from their homes by Philistine immigrants from Caphtor.

24. *Rise ye up, take your journey, and pass over the torrent Arnon*] the continuation, after the parenthesis, of v.[19], as v.[13] of v.[9]. The Israelites, standing on the S. bank of the Arnon, were thereupon commanded to cross it, and received permission to commence hostilities with the Amorites, who occupied the territory between the 'Ammonites and the Jordan. The Amorites, unlike Edom, Moab, and 'Ammon, were not allied by blood with the Israelites. The Southern part of the Amorite territory, according to Nu. 21^{26}, had formerly been in the occupation of the Moabites, but Siḥon wrested it from them, and forced them to withdraw S. of the Arnon.—**25.** *This day*] the day, viz. on which the Arnon is crossed, and the territory to be conquered entered.—*To put the fear of thee and the dread of thee*] cf. 11^{25}.—*That are under the whole heaven*] a rhetorical hyperbole (4^{19} Job 37^{3} 41^{3}); in 11^{25} Ex. $15^{14\text{-}16}$

23. והעוים הישבים וג'] the *casus pendens*, as 7^{15} 14^{27} Gn. 28^{13} Is. 9^{1} &c. (G-K. § 143; Dr. § 197. 1).—**24.** קֻומוּ סְּעוּ] the daghesh in ס is "euphonic," being probably designed to secure the distinct articulation of the consonant: cf. Gn. 19^{2} Ex. 12^{31} קֻומוּ צְּאוּ, 1 S. 15^{6} סֻרוּ רְּדוּ, Jer. 49^{30} Hos. 8^{10}. On this and similar exceptional uses of daghesh forte, see further Baer, Preface to *Liber Proverbiorum*, p. xiv, G-K. § 20. 2*a*(2)R., Delitzsch on Ps. 94^{12}; most fully König, i. p. 54 ff.—**25.** על פני] 11^{25} Ex. 20^{20b}.—אשר]=*so that*, as $4^{10.\,40}$ 6^{3} *al.* (*Lex.* אשר **8 b**).—ישמעון שמעך] the same idiom, Gn. 29^{13} Nu. 14^{15} Na. 3^{19} *al.*—וְחָלוּ] from חול (with tone *milra'*, on account of the ו consec.), *to be in anguish* (used often of a woman in travail),—a strong word, rare in prose (1 S. 31^{3}); with מפני, as Jer. 5^{22} Ps. 96^{9} *al.*, cf. Is. 23^{5}.

Digitized by Google

23^{27} only the Canaanites, or other neighbours of Israel, are mentioned.

26–37. Refusal of Siḥon to permit Israel to pass through his land. His defeat; and the seizure of his territory by the Israelites.

Dt. 2^{26a} . . . . Nu. 21^{21} וישלח ישראל מלאכים אל סיחון מלך האמרי לאמר.
2^{27a} . . . . Nu. 21^{22} אעברה בארצך לא נטה בשדה ובכרם . . . בדרך המלך נלך.
2^{27b} . . . . (Nu. 20^{17} לא נטה ימין ושמאול.)
2^{28b} . . . . (Nu. 20^{19b} רק אין דבר ברגלי אעברה.)
2^{30} . . . . Nu. 21^{23a} ולא נתן סיחן את ישראל עבר בגבלו.
2^{32} . . . . (Nu. 21^{33b} ויצא עוג מלך הבשן לקראתם הוא וכל עמו למלחמה אדרעי.)
2^{32b} . . . . Nu. 21^{23b} יהצה.
2^{33b} . . . . (Nu. 21^{35a} ויכו אתו ואת בניו ואת כל עמו [of 'Og].)
2^{34a} . . . . Nu. 21^{25a} ויקח ישראל את כל הערים האלה.
2^{36-37} . . . Cf. Nu. 21^{24-25}.

26. *And I sent messengers, &c.*] Nu. 21^{21}.—*From the wilderness of Ḳedēmoth*] Ḳedēmoth is mentioned as belonging to Reuben, and as a Levitical city (Jos. 13^{18}; 1 Ch. $6^{64 (79)}$). The precise site is unknown; but from a comparison of Nu. 21^{21} it seems probable that it lay somewhere on or near the upper course of the Arnon, perhaps on the N. edge of the "wilderness" on the East of Moab (Nu. 21^{11}, cf. Dt. 2^{8b}): had it been much to the West of the position here indicated, it would have been within the territory of Moab, which the Israelites did not enter. *Ḥeshbon* is frequently mentioned as the capital of Siḥon (Nu. $21^{26. 34}$ Jud. 11^{19} &c.): it was situate on a low hill rising out of the elevated table-land (3^{10}) about 16 miles E. of the Jordan, where its ruins (of the Roman period) are still visible. Though assigned by the Israelites to Reuben (Jos. 13^{17}), it was afterwards occupied by the Moabites (who regained their territory N. of the Arnon), and is alluded to as being in their possession (Is. 15^4 $16^{8. 9}$ Jer. 48^2). Comp. Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 528 f.; more fully, *Survey of E.*

26. דברי שלום] appended loosely, as an apposition *κατὰ σύνεσιν*, to במלאכים.—**27–29.** אעברה . . . אלך וג׳] the first person *singular*, the nation being conceived as a unity, and the words being spoken accordingly in the name of the people as a whole. So frequently, as Ex. 14^{25} 17^3 Nu. $20^{18. 19b}$ 21^{22} Jos. 9^7 17^{14} &c.: in the prophets, Is. 12^1 25^1 26^9 Jer. $10^{19. 20}$ &c.: cf. *L.O.T.* p. 366 f. In the English version the Hebrew idiom is sometimes concealed, by the plural being substituted (*e.g.* Ex. 14^{25}). The 2nd and 3rd persons singular

Digitized by Google

Palestine, pp. 104–9.—**27.** *Let me pass through thy land*] exactly as Nu. 21^{22a}.—*In the way, in the way, will I go*] varied from Nu. 21^{22b} (in the king's way will we go).—*I will not turn either to the right hand or to the left*] from Nu. 20^{17}, in the application to *Edom*, with אָסוּר *I will turn*, the word used elsewhere in the same phrase by D (5^{29}), for נִטֶּה *we will incline*.—**28.** *Thou shalt sell me food, &c.*] cf. v.[6].—*Only let me pass through on my feet*] as Nu. 20^{19} (in the application to *Edom*).—**29.** *As the children of 'Esau . . . and the Moabites . . . did unto me*] it is not distinctly stated in v.[2-8] whether the Edomites acceded to the request of the Israelites, though there is nothing to suggest that they did not do so. The statement here is not incompatible with what is related Nu. 20^{18-21}: though the Edomites may have opposed the proposal of the Israelites, when on their *Western* border, to pass *through* their territory, they may not have regarded them with the same unfriendliness, or have been unwilling to assist them, while journeying Northwards, away from them, on their *Eastern* border. The Moabites, in $23^{5(4)}$, are censured for *not* having "met Israel with bread or water on the way": the expression used, however, suggests that the Moabites were not forward in offering them food in a friendly spirit (cf. Is. 21^{14}), and is not necessarily inconsistent with their having *sold* it to them, perhaps under compulsion, in return for money payment.—**30.** *But Sihon, &c.*] varied from Nu. 21^{23} (see the Table).—*As at this day* (כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה)] *i.e.* as is now the case. The phrase is mostly used for the purpose of calling attention to the fulfilment of a promise (or threat) in

are used analogously.—**27.** בדרך בדרך אלך] the repetition expresses emphasis, "*in the way* (and nowhere else) will I go": comp. 16^{20} 1 S. 2^{3} (Ew. § 313^{a}; G-K. § $123d^{3}$).—**28.** ואכלתי] the tone is *mil'el*, with ו consec., on account of the disj. acc. (Dr. § 104).—**30.** העברנו בו] "to let us pass *through him*," *i.e.* through his dominion: cf. Nu. 20^{18} לא תעבר בי.—הקשה את רוחו] the usual phrase is הקשה לב, Ex. 7^{3} (P), 13^{15} (JE), Ps. 95^{8} Pr. 28^{14}.—וְאִמֵּץ את לבבו] אִמֵּץ לב has usually a good sense, *to strengthen the heart*=*to encourage*: as here, only 15^{7} 2 Ch. 36^{13}. On וְ (not consec.) used to connect synonyms, see Dr. § 132.—כיום הזה] *as* (at) *this day*. So $4^{20.38}$ 8^{18} 10^{15} 29^{27} Gn. 50^{20} 1 S. $22^{8.13}$ 1 K. 3^{6} 8^{24} (=2 Ch. 6^{15}) [61] Jer. 11^{5} 25^{18} 32^{20} $44^{6.23}$ Dan. 9^{7} (from Ezr. 9^{7}) [15] (from Jer. 32^{20}) 1 Ch. 28^{7}†: in the form כהיום הזה Dt. 6^{24} Jer. 44^{22} Ezr. $9^{7.15}$ Neh. 9^{10} (Jer. 32^{20}), and (differently) Gn. 39^{11}†. In Jer. 25^{18} it is not expressed by 𝔊, and must, as the context shows, be a gloss, inserted after the fulfilment of the prophecy: see, against Graf's view of

Digitized by Google

the event: as the occurrences (see below) show, it gives expression to a thought which is particularly common in Dt., and in writers reflecting the Deuteronomic point of view: the prayers in 1 K. 8, Ezr. Neh. Dan. are all moulded largely in the Deut. phraseology.—**31.** *Behold, I have begun, &c.*] with Siḥon's refusal to accede to Israel's request, Jehovah has already "begun" the execution of His purpose, and Israel is now free to invade his territory.—*Deliver up before*] comp. on 1^{8}.—*Begin, possess*] הָחֵל רָשׁ, as v.[24], but strengthened by the addition of לרשת את ארצו.—**32.** *And Siḥon came forth to meet us, he and all his people, for battle unto Jahaẓ*] Nu. 21^{23}. The phrasing, however, agrees with that used Nu. 21^{33b} of *ʿOg*. *Jahaẓ* is often mentioned as a city in the territory N. of the Arnon, belonging to Reuben (Jos. 13^{18}, beside Dibon, Beth-baʿal-meʿon, and Ḳedēmoth), or as in the possession of the Moabites (Is. 15^{4} Jer. 48^{34}: cf. the Moabite stone, l. 18–21), situated (Jer. 48^{21}) on the "Mishor," or high table-land (3^{10}), and (Nu. 21^{23}) in the direction of the "wilderness," *i.e.* the open plains on the East (2^{8b}). Euseb. (*Onom.* ed. Lag. p. 264) states that it was shown between Dibon and Medabah—a situation which satisfies the conditions of the narrative, according to which Siḥon sallied forth from his capital, Ḥeshbon, to meet the advancing Israelites. The site has not, however, been recovered.—**33.** *And we smote him, and his sons, and all his people*] as Nu. 21^{35a} (of *ʿOg*), "And they smote him, and his sons, and all his people."* The expression used of Siḥon's defeat in Nu. 21^{24} is different; and neither there nor in Jud. 11^{21} is any mention made of the slaughter of Siḥon's *sons*.—**34.** *And we took all his cities at that time* (1^{9})] cf. Nu. 21^{25a}.—*And we devoted, &c.*] or

the meaning of the expression, Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, ii. § 56. 1.—**34.** עִיר מְתִים] *city of men, i.e.* a city so far as it consisted of men, nearly = city male-population. So 3^{6}, and (though not so pointed by the Massorites) Jud. 20^{48}, where it is opposed to cattle and property generally (cf. here v.[35] 3^{7}).—מְתִים] chiefly poetical, the only prose-phrases being עִיר מתים, מְתֵי מִסְפָּר Gn. 34^{30} (J) Dt. 4^{27} Jer. 44^{28} Ps. 105^{12} (= 1 Ch. 16^{19})†, and מְתֵי מְעָט Dt. 26^{5} 28^{62}†. The word is also preserved in the ancient pr.

* If the view stated on 3^{1-3} be adopted, the phrasing of v.[33] (which corresponds to that of 3^{1b}) will of course be original in Dt., and the relation of 2^{33b} to Nu. 21^{35a} will be reversed.

Digitized by Google

treated as *ḥérem* (on 7[2]), the inhabitants being slain, and the cattle and property retained as spoil. This fact is not mentioned in Nu. 21. The observance of the *ḥérem*, in the conquests of the Israelites, is often noted specially by D and D[2] (see *ib.*).—*Every city of men*] see below.—*Left no survivor*] השאיר שריד is a phrase esp. used by Deut. writers 3[3] (= Nu. 21[35]: see on 3[1-8]) Jos. 8[22] 10[28. 30. 33. 37. 39. 40] 11[8] (all D[2]) 2 K. 10[11]†.—**36.** *From ʿAroʿer, which is on the edge of the torrent-valley of Arnon*] the same description in 3[12] 4[48] Jos. 12[2] 13[9. 16] 2 K. 10[33] (without שְׂפַת): ʿAroʿer, alone, also Nu. 32[34] Jud. 11[26] 2 S. 24[5] (see 𝔏) Jer. 48[19] 1 Ch. 5[8] (on Is. 17[2] see Dillm.), and on the Moabite stone, line 26 (as built by Meshaʿ).

The Arnon, which formed the N. border of Moab (Nu. 21[13]), now the Wady Mojib, is a remarkably clearly-defined boundary line. The country N. and S. of it is a far-reaching plain: it is suddenly broken by a deep rift, with precipitous sides,—at a point some 10 miles E. of the Dead Sea, about 3 miles broad and 2000 feet deep; at the bottom of this valley the Arnon flows, amid rich tropical vegetation,—for the air at such a great depth has a genial warmth; at the point where it enters the Dead Sea, the current has a width of some 80 feet, and is 4 feet in depth (Tristram, *Moab*, pp. 125–130). A desolate heap of ruins, 'Ara'ir, on the N. edge of this ravine, "just overhanging the brow," and about a mile from the stream (*ib.* pp. 129–131), marks the site of the ancient 'Aro'er.

The city which is in the torrent (or *torrent-valley*)] so Jos. 13[9. 16] 2 S. 24[5] (read with 𝔏: "and they began from ʿAroʿer, and from [וּמִן for יְמִן] the city that is in the middle of the torrent-valley, towards Gad, and on to Jaʿzer"),—each time immediately after ʿAroʿer. The city meant is not altogether certain; but it is a reasonable conjecture that it may be ʿAr (Knob., Dietrich, in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 334 ff., Keil, Dillm.). Nor is it certain in what part of the course of the Arnon the city referred to lay; a site at its confluence with the Lejjûn, where there is "a piece of pasture ground, in the midst of which stands a hill with ruins on it," has been suggested (Sir G. Grove, *DB.*[1] 1862, *s.v.* Arnon; Dietrich, p. 335 f.).—*Even unto Gileʿad*]

names מתושאל and מתושלח. Otherwise, it fell out of use in Hebrew. In Ethiopic, it is an ordinary word for *man*, *husband* (*e.g.* Mark 10[12] Luke 2[36]). Of course it has no etym. connexion with מות, מֵת, מֵתִים.—שריד] *fugitive*, *survivor* (from a defeat): Arab. *sharada* is *to take fright and run away* (of an animal).—**35.** בזזנו לנו] 3[7] 20[14] Jos. 8[2. 27] 11[14]; ל, as 1[13].—**36.** שגבה] only here in prose; and only once besides at all in Qal,

Digitized by Google

Siḥon's territory was bounded on the N. by the Jabboḳ (Nu. 21^{24} Jos. 12^{2}), which separated the N. "half" of Gile'ad from the S. "half" (on 3^{10}). The limit assigned is therefore a vague one: it cannot be said definitely that either the S. half (inclusively) or the N. half (exclusively) is in the writer's mind.—**37.** Only the land of the 'Ammonites they did not encroach upon (v.[19]), *even the whole side of the torrent of Jabbok, and the cities of the hill-country*—*i.e.* the region lying along the upper course of the Jabboḳ (the Wady Zerḳa) on the East, and the neighbouring hill-country inhabited by the 'Ammonites. The country taken by the Israelites from the Amorites, and occupied afterwards by Reuben and Gad, lay wholly to the *West* of this. Cf. Nu. 21^{24} ("And Israel possessed the land of Siḥon, from Arnon to Jabboḳ, even [*sc.* eastwards] unto the children of 'Ammon"); Jud. 11^{22}. In Dt. 3^{16} Jos. 12^{2} the Jabboḳ is called the "border of the children of 'Ammon": in the upper part of its course, the Jabboḳ runs S. to N. in a semicircle, passing Rabbath-'Ammon; and the 'Ammonite territory, according to these passages, lay to the East of this.

With the description of the territory taken by the Israelites, and of its limits, in $2^{36f.}$ $3^{8.10.12-17}$ 4^{48-49} should be compared those in Jos. 13,—viz. *a.* (generally) v.[8-12] (supplying, in v.[8] at the beginning, after 𝔊 [*For the half-tribe of Manasseh, and*] *with it* the Reubenites, &c.); *b.* (Reuben) v.[16-23a] (to *Ḥeshbon*) [23a]; *c.* (Gad) v.[25-27]; *d.* (half of Manasseh) v.[30-31]. Cf. also Jos. 12^{1-6}. The passages quoted appear all to belong to D^2 (or to a Deut. hand); many of the expressions used are similar to those occurring here in Dt.

III. 1–7. Defeat of 'Og, the king of Bashan, and conquest of his territory.

Dt. 3^{1-2} . . . . Nu. 21^{33-34} (the entire verses).
3^{3b} . . . . Nu. 21^{35a} ויכו אתו ואת בניו ואת כל עמו עד בלתי השאיר לו שריד.
3^{4-7} . . . . Cf. Nu. 21^{35b} (וירשו את ארצו).

1–3. V.[1-2] agrees verbally with Nu. 21^{33-34}—the only difference being the substitution of the first person for the third.

Job 5^{11}.—**37.** יד] fig. = *side*: cf. Nu. 13^{29} על יד הירדן; Jud. 11^{26} הערים אשר על ידי ארנון.—וכל אשר וג׳] *and all that J. commanded us* (*sc.* not to approach); cf. 4^{23}. But 𝔊 (καθότι) expresses כְּכָל־אֲשֶׁר וג׳ *according to all that J. commanded us*, which may be the true reading.

Digitized by Google

V.[3] also agrees in substance with Nu. 21[35], the characteristic phrase in [3b] עד בלתי השאיר לו שריד being common to both.

The *prima facie* view of the three verses in Dt. would be that they were based upon the passage in Numbers. Several of the expressions common to the two passages are, however, Deuteronomic (see the notes), while they are alien to the general style of JE's narrative in Numbers: it is remarkable also that in Nu. 22[2], while the conquest of Siḥon (Nu. 21[23-25]) is referred to, that of 'Og is unnoticed; hence Dillm. may be right in supposing that the passage belonged originally to Dt., and that Nu. 21[33-35] is an insertion, based upon Dt. 3[1-3] (or in v.[35a] upon Dt. 2[33b]), and introduced into the text of Numbers for the purpose of supplying what seemed to be an omission. So also Bacon, *Triple Tradition of the Exodus* (1894), p. 211.

1. *And we turned* (וַנֵּפֶן)] cf. 1[7. 24. 40] 2[1. 3. 8].—*By the way to Bashan*] in the Heb. usually with the article, "the Bashan," —not improbably (see Wetzstein in Del. *Hiob*,[2] pp. 556–558) corresponding to بَثْنَة, and signifying properly *soft and fertile ground.* From the notices contained in the OT., it appears that Bashan embraced the region lying N. and NE. of "Gile'ad" (see on v.[10]), and bounded on the S. by the Jarmuk, and a line passing through Edre'i to Salchah, on the W. by Geshur and Ma'acah, on the N. stretching out towards Ḥermon (cf. Jos. 12[1b. 5]), and on the E. extending as far as the great range of extinct volcanoes called the Jebel Ḥauran (*i.e.* mountain of the Ḥauran), about 40 miles ESE. of the Sea of Galilee. From the fact that Salchah (v.[10]) is mentioned as a frontier city of Bashan, it seems that the eastern and southern declivities of Jebel Ḥauran were not included in it (cf. Wetzstein, *Hauran*, pp. 39–42, 83–86; Guthe, *ZDPV.* 1890, p. 230 ff.).

Bashan was noted in antiquity for its rich pastures and its extensive forests of oak, especially abundant on the W. slopes of Jebel Ḥauran (comp. the allusions to its pastures Mic. 7[14] Jer. 50[19], to its herds of cattle Dt. 32[14] Ps. 22[13] Ez. 39[18] Am. 4[1], to its oaks Is. 2[13] Zech. 11[2] Ez. 27[6], cf. Is. 33[9] Nah. 1[4]). With the exception of the Leja (see on v.[4-5]), the soil of the corresponding region is described still as being singularly fertile—the Ḥauran has been called the granary of Damascus; and its oak forests are frequently alluded to by travellers (J. L. Porter, *Five Years in Damascus*, chap. xi. ed. 2, pp. 186, 190, 200, 202; chap. xii. pp. 218, 227; chap. xiii. pp. 260, 261, &c.; Tristram, *Land of Israel*, pp. 448, 453, &c.).

III. 1. אדרעי] *to* Edre'i, after the verb of motion יצא; not "*at* Edre'i" (RV.), except as an accommodation to English idiom (similarly 1 S. 1[24]

Digitized by Google

Edreʿi] on his S. frontier 1^{4}.—**2.** *Fear not*] $1^{21.29}$ 3^{22}; Jos. 8^{1} 10^{8} (D^{2}). Both this and וַנֵּפֶן are more in the Deut. style than in that of JE.—*Given into thy hand*] v.[3] 1^{27} $2^{24.30}$ 7^{24} 20^{13} 21^{10} Ex. 23^{31} Nu. $21^{2.34}$ Jos. 2^{24} 6^{2} 7^{7} $8^{1.7.18}$ $10^{8.19.30.32}$ 11^{8} $21^{42(44)}$ $24^{8.11}$.—*Unto Siḥon*] $2^{33f.}$.—**3.** *No survivor*] on 2^{34}.—**4.** *At that time*] so v.[8.12.21.23]: cf. on 1^{9}.—**4–5.** ***Threescore cities, all the region of Argob, the kingdom of ʿOg in Bashan: all these*** (being) ***fenced cities,*** (with) ***high walls, gates, and bars, besides very many cities of the country-folk***] the "region of Argob" (חֶבֶל אַרְגֹּב) is mentioned also v.[13.14] 1 K. 4^{13} ("the region of Argob, which is in Bashan, even threescore great cities, (with) walls and brazen bars"). What locality, however, is denoted by it is uncertain.

The Targums represent "Argob" by טרכונא, *i.e. Trachonitis*, now *el-Leja*, a district about 30 miles S. of Damascus, and 40 miles E. of the Sea of Galilee; and this identification has been acquiesced in by many modern commentators. The Leja is a remarkable volcanic formation, of irregular

---

2 S. 20^{3} &c.). Comp. on 1 S. 2^{29}.—**2.** נתתי] the pf., of an act which, in the intention of the speaker, is completed (G-K. § 106. 3[a]; Dr. § 13).—**3.** עד בלתי הִשְׁאִיר לו שריד] so Nu. 21^{35} Jos. 8^{22} 10^{33} 11^{8} 2 K. 10^{11}. It is disputed whether הִשְׁאִיר be (*a*) a perfect (G-K. § 53 R.[2]; W. R. Smith, *Journ. of Phil.* xvi. 72), the subject being the implicit הַמַּשְׁאִיר (cf. on 1 S. 16^{4}), or (*b*) the inf. const. with anomalous *ḥireq* (Ols. § 191[f.]; Ew. § 238[d]; König, p. 276, cf. 212). Against (*a*) is the fact that בלתי is not used elsewhere with a finite verb to express a *categorical* negative, except in the doubtful passages Ez. 13^{3} Dan. 11^{18} (cf. Dr. § 41 *Obs.*, and *Lex. s.v.*); (*b*) has accordingly presumption in its favour. The *ḥireq* in the inf. is however very much opposed to analogy (comp. on 7^{24}); and it may be legitimately doubted whether the Massorites have preserved truly the original pronunciation, and whether הַשְׁאִיר should not be read.—**4.** ארגב] the supposition that this signifies *stony* is a mere conjecture, based upon the questionable assumption that the root רגב is cognate with רגם. ארגב would be more naturally connected with רֶגֶב *clods of earth*, Job 21^{33} 38^{38}; in which case it would denote a rich and earthy soil, rather than a stony one (אַרְגֹּב 1 S. $20^{19.41}$ 𝕲 will mean correspondingly, not a cairn of stones, but a *mound of earth*). חבל is a *cord* (Jos. 2^{15}), or *measuring-line* (Am. 7^{17} Mic. 2^{5}), used fig. of a *measured portion*, or *allotment* (Jos. 17^{14} 19^{9}): there is no reason whatever for supposing it either to have been specially adapted to denote, or to have actually denoted, the rocky border of the Leja.—**5.** חומה גבהה דלתים ובריח] in loose appos. with ערים בצרת (the sing. having a collective force): cf. 1 K. 4^{13} 2 Ch. 8^{5}; also, for the combin. ד׳ וב׳, 1 S. 23^{7} עיר דלתים ובריח Ez. 38^{11} Job 38^{10} Jer. 49^{31} 2 Ch. 14^{6}.—הפרזי] *countryman* (coll. = *country-folk*), 1 S. 6^{18} Est. 9^{19}†; cf. פְּרָזוֹת *open country-districts*, Ez. 38^{11} Zech. 2^{8} Est. 9^{19}†. Ez. 38^{11} shows how the עָרֵי הַפְּרָזוֹת were opposed to cities protected by walls and barred gates.

Digitized by Google

oval shape, about 22 miles from N. to S., and 14 miles from W. to E., the rugged surface of which consists of innumerable rocks or boulders of black basalt, intermingled with fissures and crevices in every direction (*DB.* *s.v.* ARGOB). In point of fact it owes its origin (Wetzstein, *Hauran*, p. 25 f.) to streams of lava emitted from the volcanoes—the "conical peaks" of which (Porter, *Damascus*, pp. 183, 186, 190, 227, &c.) are alluded to in Ps. 68[15f.] (see RV.*m.*)—forming the range of Jebel Hauran, a little SW. of the Leja. The surface of the Leja is elevated some 20–30 feet above the surrounding plain, and "its border is as clearly defined as a rocky coast, which it very much resembles" (Porter, p. 282). The Leja contains the remains of several ancient cities; and the labyrinthine gullies and ravines, with lofty overhanging rocks, form a natural fortress, which a small body of defenders can hold against even a determined invader (hence the name Leja, i.e. *laja'ah*, refuge, retreat): in 1838, 6000 Druses defended it successfully against Ibrahim Pasha, who lost 20,000 men in the attempt to force it. The natural border of the Leja, just referred to, is regarded, by those who identify it with the ancient Argob, as being denoted by the term חבל (i.e. *cord*, or *boundary-line*); and "Argob" itself has been supposed to signify *stony*. The identification is however extremely doubtful. Not only (see p. 48) is its philological basis highly questionable; but, though the apparent identification of Argob in v.[4. 13] with the entire kingdom of Bashan ought not perhaps to be pressed (the terms of the description being rhetorical rather than scientific, and in 1 K. 4[13] the region being mentioned as a district *in* Bashan), in v.[14] it is described as extending, like Bashan itself in Jos. 12[5], as far W. as Geshur and Ma'acah, which must have been considerably beyond the limits of the Leja. Moreover, as Wetzstein remarks (p. 83), the physical character of the Leja, while presenting formidable obstacles to an assailant, could have had little to attract a people in need of rich pasture for its flocks and herds.

Nor does this identification derive any support from the notice of the "threescore cities," with "high walls, gates, and bars," belonging to the region of Argob (Dt. 3[4] 1 K. 4[13]). The remains of ancient cities are by no means confined to the Leja: indeed, they are much more numerous on the slopes of the Jebel Ḥauran itself and in the country to the S. and E. of it, —the latter forming no part of the ancient Bashan: according to Wetzstein (p. 42), "the E. and S. slopes of the Jebel Ḥauran contain some 300 deserted cities and villages." (Comp. the notice in 1 Ch. 2[23] of the 60 dependent towns of Ḳĕnâth [Nu. 32[42]], *i.e.* Ḳanawât, on the W. declivity of the Jebel Ḥauran, Porter, pp. 204-216.) The dwellings in these deserted cities are of a remarkable character (see Wetzstein, pp. 44-62). Some are the habitations of Troglodytes, being caverns hollowed out in the rock, and so arranged within as to form two, three, or more chambers (for cattle, stores, &c.): others are for purposes of concealment in warfare, being pits sunk in the earth, with shafts, invisible from above, leading horizontally into subterranean chambers—a large underground residence at Edre'i of this kind was explored by Wetzstein (p. 47); others consist of dwelling-houses, built solidly of massive blocks of basalt, with heavy doors of the same material, moving on pivots, the cities themselves being protected by

Digitized by Google

walls and lofty towers, and in such good preservation that it is difficult for the traveller not to believe that they must still be inhabited (p. 49). (Comp. the descriptions by Porter of the ruins of Burāḳ, p. 164 f., Sauwarah, p. 169, Bathanîyeh, p. 184 f., Shuḳa, p. 188 f., Shuhba, pp. 194–196, Ḳanawāt, pp. 204–215, Suweideh, pp. 220–226, Boṣrā, pp. 231–239, Ṣalchad, pp. 248–250, &c.) To what extent, however, these remains are those of the ancient cities of 'Og, must be considered doubtful. As Wetzstein points out (p. 103), the architecture, the sculptures, and the Greek inscriptions (which are *original*, and not later additions to the stones on which they are found) show that in the majority of cases these trans-Jordanic towns arose in post-Christian times: but in some instances the remains are more ancient; the Troglodyte dwellings are of remote antiquity; the ruins of Ḥibikke (p. 48 f.) are also ancient; and very old building materials have probably been preserved in such cities as Boṣrā and Salchad. On the whole it may be concluded that among the numerous remains of villages and cities in the Ḥauran are some which may, at least in part, be reasonably referred to the ancient kingdom of 'Og, though it is difficult to determine definitely which these are, and there are no sufficient grounds for limiting them to those contained in the Leja.

The precise locality denoted by the "region of Argob" can thus be determined only by conjecture. Wetzstein concluded (p. 82) in favour of the district between Jordan and the Zumleh range, about 15 miles to the East; Dillmann thinks it may have lain more to the E. than this, between Gerasa Edreʿi and ʿAshtaroth on the W., and Jebel Ḥauran on the E.; Guthe (*ZDPV.* 1890, p. 237 f.) places it in the E. of the present Jôlān (cf. v.[14], where Geshur and Maʿacah are mentioned as forming its W. border), between Edreʿi and Nawā.

"Whether the name Argob be connected with Ἔργα, a village 15 miles W. of Gerasa, which the *Onomasticon* (ed. Lagarde, pp. 88 f., 216) identifies with Ἀργόβ, or with the Ῥαγαβᾶ of Josephus (*Ant.* xiii. 15. 5), or with the modern Râjib, a place on the Wady Râjib, which enters the Jordan between W. Zerḳa and W. 'Ajlun, cannot be determined" (Dillm.).

For further particulars regarding the Leja, the Ḥauran range, and surrounding neighbourhood, see Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria* (1822), p. 51 ff.; Porter, *Damascus*, chaps. xi.-xiv.; Cyril C. Graham, "Explorations in the Desert East of the Hauran, and in the ancient Land of Bashan," in the *Journal of the Royal Geogr. Soc.* 1858, p. 226 ff.; more briefly, in the *Cambridge Essays*, 1858, pp. 155–162; Burton and Drake, *Unexplored Syria* (1871), i. 159–196; and especially J. G. Wetzstein (for many years Prussian Consul at Damascus), *Reisebericht über Hauran und die Trachonen* (1860). Porter hardly did more than skirt the E. and W. sides of the Leja, visiting only a few towns quite on the border; Burckhardt and Wetzstein explored the interior more fully, the latter in particular reaching Dāma (p. 25 f.), the highest point of the Leja, whence

Digitized by Google

its geological formation became at once apparent to him. Graham also penetrated as far as Dāma, but his narrative (*Journal*, p. 260) is brief. Comp. the description of Trachonitis (=the Leja) in Josephus, *Ant.* xv. 1, and Strabo xvi. 2 (cf. Wetzstein, pp. 36–38). The best and most recent map of the district is that published in the *ZDPV.* Heft 4, 1890, on the basis of Dr. A. Stübel's observations and measurements in 1882, accompanied by copious bibliographical and topographical notes, by Guthe and others, pp. 225–302. See also Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* 1875, p. 419 ff.

6–7. *And we devoted them, &c.*] the cities of ʿOg were treated in the same manner as those of Siḥon (2^{34-35}).

Dt. 3^{8-10}		Cf. Nu. $21^{24-25. 35\,(end)}$.
3^{12-13}		Cf. Nu. 32^{33}.
3^{14}		Nu. 32^{41} ויאיר בן מנשה הלך וילכד את חותיהם ויקרא אתהן חוֹת יאיר.
3^{15}		Nu. 32^{40} ויתן משה את הגלעד למכיר בן מנשה.
3^{18b}		Nu. 32^{21} ועבר לכם כל חלוץ את הירדן לפני יהוה.
3^{19a}		Nu. 32^{26} טפנו נשינו מקננו וכל בהמתנו יהיו שם בערי הגלעד.
3^{19a}		Nu. 32^{1} ומקנה רב היה לבני ראובן ולבני גד.
3^{21-29}		* * *

8–13. Particulars respecting the country taken from Siḥon (2^{32-36}) and ʿOg (3^{1-7}), and its allotment to the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh.—8. *Beyond Jordan*] on 1^{1}.—*From the torrent-valley of Arnon unto Mount Ḥermon*] the same limits that are specified Jos. 12^{1b}.—**9.** *The Ẓidonians call Ḥermon Sirion; and the Amorites call it Sĕnīr*] a parenthetic notice, like those in $2^{11. 20}$. The name *Sirion* (שִׂרְיֹן) for Ḥermon occurs also poetically in Ps. 29^{6}: Sĕnīr (שְׂנִיר) is found Ez. 27^{5} Song 4^{8} 1 Ch. 5^{23}; from the last two passages (where it is named beside Ḥermon) it appears that it must have been the designation of a particular part of the Ḥermon-range, probably the part N. of Damascus between Baʿalbek and Ḥöms [Emesa], known to the Arabs by the same name, سنير (Abulfeda, *Tab. Syriæ*, p. 68, quoted by Ges.; *Marāẓid* (Juynb.), ii. 61, iii. 5, quoted by Knob.; Ibn Ḥauḳal, ed. de Goeje, p. 114, quoted by Dillm.). The name Sĕnīr was also known to the Assyrians (*KAT.*[2] p. 159), if not to the Egyptians as well (Sayce, *RP.*[2] vi. 41, *Monuments*, p. 341). For a fourth name of Ḥermon (שִׂיאֹן), see 4^{48}.—**10.** *All*

6. הַחֲרֵם] Ew. § 280[a], G-K. § 113. 2; cf. 9^{21} 13^{16} 27^{8}.—עיר מתים] 2^{34}.—**9.** יקראו] the impf. as 2^{11}.—האמרי] with a collective force, such as is peculiarly frequent with gentile adjectives, or patronymics (*e.g.* v.$^{12. 14}$), and hence joined with a pl. verb. The pl. אמריים or אמרים does not occur.

Digitized by Google

the cities of the table-land] RV. *plain* or *plain-country*, with marg. Or, *table-land*. The term מִישׁוֹר means *smooth* or *level land*, and is sometimes used generally (Is. 40^{4} 42^{16}), or in a figurative application (Ps. 26^{12} 27^{11}); but when provided with the art., and used in connexion with the East of Jordan, it has a special geographical sense, and denotes the elevated plateau, or table-land, on which the territory of Moab (or Reuben) lay; cf. 4^{43} (of Bezer) Jos. $13^{9.16.17.21}$ Jer. $48^{8.21}$.

"The uplands of Moab consist of a rolling plateau, about 3200 feet above the sea-level [*i.e.* 4500 feet above the Dead Sea], the western edge being cut up into deep valleys, and descending by a series of sloping hills, at angles of 45 and 50 degrees, into the Dead Sea. These uplands are naturally divided into two districts by the great chasm of Wady Mojib, the Arnon of Scripture; of these the northern portion is called by the modern Arabs El Belga [spelt Belḳa, but pronounced by the Bedawin, Belga], and extends as far north as the mountains of Gilead; while the southern part is known as El Kerek, and reaches southward to the Wady of that name" (Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 472). "The uplands are very fertile and productive, and although the soil is badly tended by the few and scattered Arab tribes who inhabit it, large tracts of pasture-land and extensive corn-fields meet the eye at every turn. Ruined villages and towns, broken walls that once enclosed gardens and vineyards, remains of ancient roads—everything in Moab tells of the immense wealth and population which that country must have once enjoyed" (*ib.* p. 473 f.; comp. Sir. G. Grove, *DB.*[1] *s.v.* MOAB).

And all Gile'ad] Gile'ad was the rough and rugged, yet picturesque, hill-country, bounded on the W. by the Jordan, on the N. by the deep glen of the Jarmuk (Hieromax), on the S. by the valley of Ḥeshbon, on the E. melting away gradually into the high plateau of Arabia. It is divided naturally into two parts by the Jabboḳ, the N. part corresponding generally to the modern *Jebel 'Ajlun*, and the S. part to the northern half of *el-Belga* (which extends from the Arnon to the Jabboḳ). The two halves of Gile'ad are sometimes spoken of separately in the OT.; cf. v.[12] Jos. $12^{2.5}$ (the S. half), Jos. 13^{31} (the N. half); and the term "Gile'ad" itself may be used, according to the context, to designate one of these halves alone, to the exclusion of the other.—*And all Bashan*] on v.[1] Here *Salchah* and *Edre'i* are indicated as two points marking its southern frontier. Salchah is named besides Jos. 12^{5}, and (as a border city of Bashan) 13^{11} 1 Ch. 5^{11}. It is usually identified with the

Digitized by Google

place called צלחד by the Nabatæans, in an Inscription of A.D. 66 (De Vogüé, *Syrie Centrale*, p. 107, cf. p. 111 f.), and by the modern Arabs, صرخد by the Arabic geographers. Ṣalchad is situated on what must have been the extreme SE. corner of Bashan, on an eminence forming one of the southernmost heights of the Jebel Ḥauran. It occupies a commanding position, and is well adapted to form a frontier fortress. The ruins include a castle, situated on the top of a conical hill, the crater of an extinct volcano, from 300 to 400 feet above the city (Porter, *Damascus*, pp. 248–253). On Edreʿi, see on 1[4]. The view (Knob., Keil, Porter, p. 271 f.) that here a different Edreʿi is intended, the *Zoraʿ* of the Arabic geographers, is not a probable one, being opposed by philological as well as other considerations; and it is now generally abandoned.—**11.** *For only ʿOg, the king of Bashan, was left of the remnant of the Rephaim*] the verse states the reason why the Israelites were able (v.[10]) to take possession of Bashan and the country just named: after the defeat of ʿOg, none of his race remained to contest with them the possession of his domain.—*Of the remnant of the Rephaim*] Jos. 12[4] 13[12], also of ʿOg: cf. on 2[11]. In proof of ʿOg's giant stature, the Writer appeals to his עֶרֶשׂ, still to be seen in Rabbah the capital city of the ʿAmmonites. Whether by this term is meant a *bed* or a *sarcophagus*, is disputed.

Elsewhere in Hebrew ערש means always a *couch*: in Aram. it signifies also a *bier* (Luke 7[14] 𝔖; Levy, *NHWB.* p. 703); and as משכב, usually *bed*, is used likewise of a resting-place in a tomb (2 Ch. 16[14]), it is thought by many that ערש may have been similarly applied, and that it denotes here a *sarcophagus* (J. D. Mich., Knob., Riehm, *HWB.*[1] p. 1109, Dillm., Oettli). ארון (*ark* or *chest*) is however the word which is so used in Heb. (Gn. 50[26]), as in Phœnician (*CIS.* I. i. 3[2. 3. 5]); so also the Aram. ארונא (*CIS.* II. i. 111; De Vogüé, *Syrie Centrale*, p. 102, in the inscription on a sarcophagus of black basalt found at Boṣrā), so that the supposed meaning of ערש is little more than conjectural. At the same time, it is true that ancient sarcophagi of black basalt are found in great numbers in the country E. of Jordan,—Knob. refers to Seetzen, *Reisen* (1854), i. 360 f., 364, 368 f.; Burckhardt, *Syria* (1822), pp. 269, 271; Buckingham, *Travels in Palestine* (1821), pp. 359, 411, 416 f. (nearly 200 perfect ones), &c.,—and are often used now as drinking-troughs: they are sometimes of large size,—Robinson, for instance (ii. 456), saw a large one near Tyre, 12 feet long by 6 feet broad and high, with a

---

11. הלח a scribe's error for הֲלֹא.

Digitized by Google

massive lid, commonly known as the "Tomb of Hiram." Thus it is not impossible that the giant relic shown at Rabbah was a sarcophagus; though, as this meaning of ערש is uncertain, it is better to suppose that what was really a sarcophagus was popularly called a "bed."

By *iron* is meant probably the black basalt of the country, which actually contains a proportion of iron (about 20 per cent.), and, as Pliny remarked, has the colour and hardness of iron.—*The cubit of a man*] *i.e.* an ordinary cubit, of full measure (cf. Is. 8^{1} Rev. 21^{17}). *Rabbah*, the capital city of the ʿAmmonites, afterward called Philadelphia, now ʿAmmān, is mentioned Jos. 13^{25} 2 S. 11^{1} (1 Ch. 20^{1}) $12^{26.\,27.\,29}$ 17^{27} Jer. $49^{2.\,3}$ Ez. $21^{25\,(20)}$ 25^{5} Am. 1^{14}: it lay on the upper course of the Jabboḳ, about 25 miles NE. of the upper end of the Dead Sea: for a fuller description of its site, see Bäd. p. 196 ff.; *Survey of Eastern Palestine*, pp. 19–64.—**12–13.** The land thus conquered was afterwards assigned by Moses to the 2½ tribes.—*From ʿAroʿer, which is by the torrent-valley of Arnon* (2^{36}), *and half the hill-country of Gileʿad* (*i.e.* the half S. of the Jabboḳ, cf. on v.[10]), *and the cities thereof*, being allotted *to the Reubenites and to the Gadites; the rest of Gileʿad* (*i.e.* the half N. of the Jabboḳ), *and all Bashan, to the half-tribe of Manasseh*, (even) *all the region of the Argob*,—the last words being epexegetical of "all Bashan" (cf. on v.[4]).—*All that Bashan is called a land of the Rephaim*] *i.e.* the kingdom of ʿOg, just mentioned, is considered a land where Rephaim ($2^{11.\,20}$) once dwelt; a notice analogous to those in $2^{11.\,20}$. On the rendering, see below.

14–17. A supplementary notice of the territory allotted to the half-tribe of Manasseh, Reuben, and Gad.—These verses repeat (in part) what has been said before, in a manner which

13. המנשה] with the article, as Jos. 1^{12} 4^{12} 12^{6} 13^{7} 18^{7} $22^{7.\,9.\,10.\,11.\,21}$†. The article with the name of a tribe (not its gentile adjective) is very unusual: הראובני, הגדי, &c. are said regularly, but not הראובן, הגד. הַלֵּוִי is used similarly (*e.g.* Ex. 6^{19} Ps. 135^{20}); but this is to be regarded as a patronymic (for הַלְוִיִי). הַקְּנִזִּי occurs only c. 4^{43} 29^{7} 2 K. 10^{23} 1 Ch. 26^{32}.—לכל הבשן ההוא יקרא] the Massorites, by placing the chief break after the *athnaḥ* at הבשן, imply the rend. of RV. But ההוא without a preceding subst. is unparalleled: the *athnaḥ* must be placed at הארגב, and the *zaqef* at ההוא, "*all that Bashan* is called," &c. (RV.*m.*). נקרא ל "there is called to . . ." = ". . . is called," as regularly (Gn. 2^{23} 2 S. 18^{18} Is. 1^{26} &c.; cf. יקראו ל v.[9]).

Digitized by Google

appears to show that they are not an original part of the text of Dt., but have been inserted by a later hand, partly (v.$^{14 f.}$) for the purpose of harmonizing it with statements in the Book of Numbers and elsewhere, partly (v.$^{16 f.}$) to supplement it with fuller particulars.—**14.** *Jair the son of Manasseh took all the region of Argob unto the border of the Geshurites and the Maʿacathites; and called them*, (even) *Bashan*, *Ḥavvoth-jair unto this day*] it has just been said that the Israelites under Moses conquered the territory here specified (v.$^{4-6}$), and that Moses had given it to the half-tribe of Manasseh (v.^{13}). The statement about Jair, therefore, to say the least, is in an unsuitable place. It is based evidently upon Nu. 32^{41} "And Jair, the son of Manasseh, went and took their tent-villages (the tent-villages of the Amorites in Gileʿad, named in v.^{39}), and called them Ḥavvoth-jair." Whereas, however, there, as in 1 K. 4^{13} (where they are expressly distinguished from the 60 cities of the Argob)—to say nothing of Jud. 10^{4}—the "Ḥavvoth-jair" are stated to have been in *Gileʿad*, they are here localized in *Bashan*. The intention of v.^{14} appears to have been to harmonize v.^{13} (which mentions Bashan) with Nu. $32^{39. 41}$ (which is silent as to Bashan) by the assumption that the district stated in Nu. 32^{41} to have been conquered by Jair was in Bashan. This incorrect localization of Jair's conquest in *Bashan*, instead of in Gileʿad, is followed by D² in Jos. 13^{30}.

That the verse represents an attempt to harmonize, appears further from the terms in which it is expressed, "and called them, (even) Bashan, Ḥavvoth-jair:" the pronoun "them" has no antecedent, and is explained very awkwardly by "Bashan"; in Nu. 32^{41} "them" has its proper antecedent, "their tent-villages," occurring just before: it seems therefore that the clause, in being transferred here, has been accommodated to its present position by this addition; the result being that just stated, viz. that what

---

14. על שמו] על here is *on the model of, after*: Gn. 48^{6} Ex. 28^{21} 2 S. 18^{18} 1 K. 16^{24}.—את הבשן] epexeg. of אֹתָם. There are parallels for the construction, though it is not genuinely idiomatic in Hebrew (as it is in Aramaic): *e.g.* Lev. 6^{8} Nu. 32^{33} Jos. 1^{2b} (לבני ישראל not in 𝔊), Jud. 21^{7} Jer. 41^{3} (את גדליה not in 𝔊), 48^{44} 51^{56} 1 Ch. 4^{42}; see also on 1 S. 21^{14} (and p. 291 f.). Here, however, the sg. הבשן after the pl. אותם renders it peculiarly harsh; and probably (as in some of the other instances) the explicit object (את־הבשן) is not original, but has been added as a gloss on the pronoun: cf. the note above.

Digitized by Google

referred properly to a conquest made by Jair in *Gile'ad*, is applied incorrectly to one made by him in *Bashan*. Keil harmonizes the passages by taking "Gile'ad" in Nu. 32^{39} 1 Ch. 2^{22} in the wider sense of the trans-Jordanic territory generally (and so as including Bashan), and by identifying the 60 strong cities of the Argob mentioned in v.[4], with the 23 "cities" of Jair, and the 37 (?) "daughters" (*i.e.* dependent towns) of Ḳenâth (in the Ḥauran-range), mentioned in 1 Ch. $2^{22f.}$, the colonization of which by Nobaḥ is narrated Nu. 32^{42}. This view saves the accuracy of one passage at the expense of another; for not only is the wider sense of "Gile'ad" improbable in a geographical description, but whereas Nu. 32^{42} expressly says that Ḳenâth and its dependent towns were called by the name of Nobaḥ, this argument implies that they were called by the name of Jair.

In the expression "Jair, the *son* of Manasseh," *son* is used in the sense of *descendant*: Jair, even if he lived in the Mosaic age, could not be literally a "son" of Manasseh. In 1 Ch. $2^{22f.}$ he is made the great-grandson of Manasseh's son Machir, the "father of Gileʿad" (cf. Jos. 17^{1}): and it is further stated that he had 23 cities in Gileʿad, which are apparently identified (v.[23]) with the "tent-villages of Jair."

In Jud. 10^{3-5} mention is made of Jair, a Gile'adite, one of the Judges, whose thirty sons had thirty cities, "which are called *the tent-villages of Jair* unto this day, in the land of Gile'ad." Though the notices of the "tent-villages of Jair" are not all perfectly clear or consistent, it is evident, in view of the amount of resemblance between them, that the same group of villages is throughout referred to. Nor is it open to reasonable doubt that it is one and the same Jair after whom they are named, and who was localized by one tradition in the age of Moses, and by another (Jud. 10^{3-5}) in the age of the Judges: had the author of Jud. 10^{4} intended to imply (Keil) that the old name of Ḥavvoth-jair was merely *revived* in the days of Jair the judge, he surely would have indicated this more distinctly than he has done.

Unto the border of the Geshurites and the Maʿacathites] named also as forming the (Western) border of Bashan Jos. 12^{5} 13^{11} (both D[2]). Geshur and Maʿacah were two Aramæan tribes (Gn. 22^{24}; 2 S. 15^{8}; 1 Ch. 19^{6}), which continued to be ruled by independent kings in David's time (2 S. 3^{3} 10^{6} $13^{37.38}$; comp. Jos. 13^{13}): 1 Ch. 2^{23} Geshur and Aram are mentioned as having taken the "tent-villages" of Jair from the Israelites. Their territory appears to have been on the W. of Bashan, between Gileʿad and Ḥermon, so that it will nearly have corresponded to the present *Jôlân*: in Fischer and Guthe's Map of Palestine (Leipzig, 1890) Geshur is placed immediately on the E. of the

Digitized by Google

Sea of Gennesareth, and Ma'acah to the N. of Geshur (cf. Guthe, *ZDPV.* 1890, p. 233).—*The tent-villages of Jair*] Nu. 32^{41} (cited on p. 55) Jos. 13^{30} Jud. 10^{4} 1 K. 4^{13} 1 Ch. 2^{23}†. The precise meaning of חַוֹּת is uncertain. حِوَآء means *a collection of tents near together* (Lane); and upon the assumption that חַוֹּת is connected with this word, it is usually rendered *tent-villages.* The term occurs only in this expression.—*Unto this day*] 2^{22} 10^{8} 11^{4} $29^{3(4)}$ 34^{6} (also Jos. 4^{9} 5^{9} 6^{25} 7^{26} $8^{28.29}$ 9^{27} 13^{13} 14^{14} 15^{63} 16^{10} 22^{3} 23^{9} Jud. $1^{21.26}$ 6^{24} 10^{4} 15^{19} 18^{12} 19^{30} *al.*). The expression, as used in this and similar passages, implies a much longer interval of time from the event recorded than a few months (1^{3} comp. with Nu. 33^{38}).—**15.** *And unto Machir I gave Gile'ad*] Nu. 32^{40}. The "Gile'ad" meant is the Northern half (on v.[10]). The verse must be, like v.[14], an insertion in the original narrative: as Dillm. remarks, "the same narrator who in v.[12-13] represents Moses as giving *half-Gile'ad* to Reuben and Gad, and *the rest of Gile'ad* to half-Manasseh, cannot immediately afterwards have said that he gave *Gile'ad* (absolutely) to Machir, whether by Machir be meant the whole of Manasseh (Nu. 26^{29}), or only a part of it (Jos. 17^{1-2})."

16–17. These verses repeat the substance of v.[12] with closer definitions.—*To the Reubenites and the Gadites* Moses *gave from Gile'ad, i.e.* from Northern Gile'ad (exclusively), *even unto the torrent of Arnon, the middle of the torrent-valley* (being) *also a border* (*i.e.* the stream itself forming the dividing line), *and unto Jabboḳ the torrent, the border of the children of 'Ammon, i.e.* to the upper part of the Jabboḳ, where circling round (on 2^{37}) it formed the W. border of the 'Ammonites, *and the 'Arábah, with the Jordan as a border, i.e.* the Eastern half of the Ghôr (1^{1}), as far as the Jordan, *from Kinnéreth unto the Sea of the 'Arábah, the Salt Sea, under the slopes of Pisgah,* i.e. along its whole course, from Kinnéreth, the city (Jos. 11^{2} 19^{35}) which gave its name to the Sea of Kinnéreth (Nu. 34^{11}), better known as the Lake of Gennesareth, to the North end of the

16. ונבול] cf. v.[17] Nu. 34^{6} Jos. $13^{23.27}$ $15^{12.47}$. A peculiar use of ו, apparently = *at the same time* (*zugleich*), *also* (*Lex.* ו **1 d**).—יבק הנחל] the same unusual order Jos. 12^{2} (in the same phrase). May v.[16-17] have been inserted here on the basis of Jos. 12^{2-3}?—**17.** והירדן] the ו introduces a circ. clause

Digitized by Google

Dead Sea, where it is overlooked by Pisgah, *eastward, i.e.* on the Eastern side of the Jordan. *Kinnéreth* (spelt sometimes *Kinărôth* or *Kinĕrôth*) was called by the later Jews Γεννησαρ (1 Macc. 11^{67} *al.*) or Γεννησαρετ (Mt. 14^{34} *al.*): it lay probably in the fertile and beautiful plain of Γεννησαρ (cf. 1 K. 15^{20}), on the NW. of the lake, described by Josephus (*B.J.* iii. 10. 8), now el-Ghuwêr.—*The Sea of the 'Arábah, the Salt Sea*] the Biblical names of what is now known as the Dead Sea: for the former, see 4^{49} 2 K. 14^{25}; for the latter, Gen. 14^{3} Nu. $34^{3.12}$ Jos. $15^{2.5}$ 18^{19}; the two in combination, as here, Jos. 3^{16} 12^{3}. (For a third name, see 11^{24}.) The name "Dead Sea" is not a Jewish appellation; it appears to have been first used by the classical authors of 1–2 cent. A.D. (cf. *DB.*[1] iii. 1173*b*).—*The slopes of Pisgah* (אַשְׁדּוֹת הַפִּסְגָּה)] the same expression 4^{49} Jos. 12^{3} 13^{20}; הָאֲשֵׁדוֹת absolutely Jos. 10^{40} 12^{8}: comp. אֶשֶׁד Nu. 21^{15}†. On the rendering, see below. The term is applied specially to the slopes of Pisgah overlooking the Dead Sea.—*Pisgah* (in Heb. always with the art. הַפִּסְגָּה: see below), with "slopes," as here, 4^{49} Jos. 12^{3} 13^{20}†; the "top of Pisgah" Nu. 21^{20} 23^{14} Dt. 3^{27} 34^{1}†. The name, as a geographical term, has not sur-

(Dr. § 157-9),—"the Jordan being at the same time a border."—אשדת הפסגה] there is no derivation for אשד in Heb.; but אשד *to pour out* (a liquid), is common in Aramaic; in 𝕿 also אֶשְׁדְּתָא (1 K. $7^{32f.}$ 10^{19}) are *supports* (the *axle-tree* of a wheel, or the *stay* of a throne). Upon the assumption that the root is אשד to *pour*, the word is generally explained as meaning *a place where water is poured down, i.e.* either a *declivity* or *sloping side* of a mountain (Ew. Kn. Ke. Di.), or the *bottom, foot* of a mountain (Ges.: cf. Ar. *safḥ, id.*, from *safaḥa*, to *pour*). 𝔙 (in Dt.) *radices*. By others the word has been held to signify *torrents;* and the reference has been supposed to be to the *'Ayūn Mūsā*, or "springs of Moses," a series of cascades, bursting out of the limestone rock in the ravine forming the northern boundary of Mt. Neba (Conder, *Heth and Moab*,[3] p. 131 f.; *Survey of E. Palestine*, p. 89 f.; Wilson, *DB.*[2] *s.v.*). The former explanation is preferable; in an enumeration like those of Jos. 10^{40} 12^{8}, cascades, however picturesque, are less likely to have been specified than natural features of a more general kind. As between the two renderings of *slope* and *foot*, Dillm. remarks that the terms of Nu. 21^{15} (notice נִשְׁעַן) favour the former.—הפסגה] the art. shows that the appellative sense of the word was still felt. In the Aram. of the Jerus. Targums, פסג is *to cleave*, and פסגא is a *cleft piece* (*e.g.* Gn. 15^{10}): the ridge may have been called *the cloven* on account of the natural features by which it was marked (𝔊 in 3^{27} Nu. 21^{20} 23^{14} (τοῦ) λελαξευμένου, 4^{49} τὴν λαξευτήν: elsewhere Φασγα).

Digitized by Google

vived; but it is plain that it must have denoted some part of the range of hills to which Nebo (32^{49}) belonged, and which, broken by numerous wadys, slopes down into the Southern part of the ʿArábah, E. and NE. of the Dead Sea (cf. on 34^{1}).

18–22. How Moses had, at the same time, bound the 2½ trans-Jordanic tribes to assist their brethren in the conquest of Canaan, and had also encouraged Joshua in view of the office devolving upon him.—18. *I commanded you*] "you" is said here inexactly for "the 2½ tribes amongst you."—*At that time*] v.^{4}.—*Ye shall pass over armed, &c.*] see Nu. $32^{17.\,20b.\,21.\,26f.}$ (JE),$^{28\text{-}32}$ (P); also Jos. 1^{14} 4^{12} (both D²).—**19.** *Only your wives, &c.*] Nu. $32^{16.\,17b.\,24.\,26}$ (JE); Jos. 1^{14a}.—*Much cattle*] Nu. 32^{1}.—*Which I have given you*] v.$^{12f.}$: Nu. $32^{16.\,17.\,24.\,34\text{-}38.\,39.\,41\text{-}42}$.—**20.** *Until Jehovah give rest unto*] the same expression, 12^{10} 25^{19} Jos. $1^{13.\,15}$ 21^{42} 22^{4} 23^{1} (all D²).—*Beyond Jordan*] of the territory W. of Jordan, the standpoint of the speaker being maintained, as v.^{25}. Comp. the Introd. § 4.—**21–22.** Moses bids Joshua take courage for the future (cf. the direction given in 1^{38}) by the thought of Israel's recent successes. This encouragement of Joshua is not mentioned in Nu. 32.—**21.** *Thine eyes are those that saw* (עֵינֶיךָ הָרֹאֹת)] cf. 4^{3} 11^{7}.—**22.** *Ye shall not fear them*] cf. v.^{2}: the Writer's thought passes from Joshua to the people generally.—*That fighteth for you*] 1^{30}.—Dillm. feels a difficulty in regard to v.$^{21\text{-}22}$ on the ground that they unduly anticipate v.^{28} $31^{7.\,23}$: but—at least if 1^{38} be allowed to belong to the original text of Dt.—they do but exemplify how the injunction there given might have been carried out, when a suitable occasion arose; and v.^{28} the formal institution of

18. חלוצים תעברו] on the constr. of חלוצים (an implicit accus.), see Dr. § 161. 2, 3; G-K. 118. 5: cf. 4^{27} 9^{3} Ex. 13^{18} Is. 33^{1}.—**19.** מִקְנֵכֶם] for מִקְנֵיכֶם (Gn. 47^{16} *al.*): the form may be either sg. (the *ê* being contr. from the orig. -*ai* of מִקְנֶה), for the usual מִקְנְכֶם (cf. Is. 30^{23} מִקְנֶיךָ with a sg. verb), or pl. (cf. the pl. verb, 1 Ch. 5^{9}); G-K. § 93. 3 R.^{3} The term being a collective one, the former view is the more probable.—**20.** וירשו . . . ושבתם] pff. with ו consec. in contin. of עד אשר יניח: Dr. § 115 (*s.v.* עד).—**21.** עיניך הראות] emphatic: "thine eyes *have seen*" (RV.) would correspond to the ordinary עיניך ראו (4^{9} 7^{19} *al.*): cf. 4^{3} 11^{7}: similarly 8^{18} 20^{4} Is. 14^{27} *al.* (Dr. § 135. 7).—**22.** י׳ אלהיכם הוא הנלחם לכם] "J. your God, *he is the one that* fighteth for you": הנלחם with the art., as הראות v.^{21}. On the emph. הוא, *v.* Dr. § 199, *Lex. s.v.*: cf. 9^{3} $31^{6.\,8}$; 4^{35} (יהוה הוא האלהים); 10^{9} (יהוה הוא נחלתו) 18^{2}; 12^{23} (הדם הוא)

Digitized by Google

Joshua is enjoined, to which a renewed command for his encouragement is not more than naturally attached.

23–29. Moses' entreaty to be permitted to enter Canaan refused by Jehovah. He is directed to institute Joshua formally as his successor.—This supplication of Moses is mentioned only here.—*At that time*] *i.e.* immediately after the successes against Siḥon and 'Og: so v.$^{18. 21}$.—**24.** *O Lord Jehovah* (אדני יהוה)] 9^{26}; not very common in the historical books (Gn. $15^{2. 8}$ Jos. 7^{7} Jud. 6^{22} 16^{28} 2 S. $7^{18. 19. 19. 20. 28. 29}$ 1 K. 2^{26} 8^{53}); more frequent in the prophets, especially Amos and Ezekiel.—*Thou* (emph.) *hast begun to show thy servant thy greatness, &c.*] the ground of Moses' petition: he has been permitted to see the beginning of Jehovah's mighty acts on behalf of His people; may he not also, in view of Jehovah's power, be allowed to witness their continuation?—*Begun*] $2^{24. 25. 31}$.—*Thy greatness* (גָּדְלְךָ)] 5^{21} 9^{26} 11^{2}.—*And thy mighty hand*] 6^{21} 7^{8} 9^{26} 34^{12}, cf. Jos. 4^{24} (D^2); comp. in JE Ex. 3^{19} 6^{1} 13^{9} 32^{11} Nu. 20^{20} (of Edom): see also on 4^{34}.—*What god is there, &c.*] Ex. 15^{11} (the Song).—**25.** *The good land*] 1^{35}.—*Beyond Jordan*] v.^{20}.—*This goodly mountain*] rather *hill-country*, the reference being generally to the elevated land, of which the territory W. of Jordan largely consists ($1^{7. 20}$).—**26.** *But Jehovah was enraged with me for your sakes* (למענכם)] see on 1^{37} (בגללכם); and cf. 4^{21} (על דבריכם).—*Was enraged* (ויתעבר)] the word is an uncommon one, and stronger even than the התאנף of 1^{37} 4^{21}, expressing properly, it seems, the idea of *going beyond* due bounds: Ps. $78^{21. 59. 62}$ 89^{39} Pr. 14^{16} (see Delitzsch) 20^{2} 26^{17}†. Cf. the cognate subst. עֶבְרָה, used often of God (Hos. 5^{10} Is. $9^{18 (19)}$ &c.).—**27.** Moses may only view the Promised Land from afar. This permission is not mentioned in JE. To judge, however, from the notice in $34^{1. 4}$ (JE) of Moses having acted in accordance with it, it may well have been contained in the original narrative of JE, before this was curtailed in parts in the process of combination

הנפש).—וָאֶתְחַנַּן] G-K. § 29. 4 (Dr. § 103), and § 54. 3 R.[1]—**24.** אשר] = *since* (*Lex.* אשר, **8 c**).—גבורתֶךָ] defect. for גבורתֶיךָ: cf. דְּרָכְךָ (Ex. 33^{13} Jos. 1^{8}), אֹהָלְךָ (Jud. 19^{9}).—**26.** ויתעבר] Schröder and Di. conjecture that the uncommon word may have been suggested to the writer by his use of אעברה v.^{25}.—רב לך] on 1^{6}.—אל־תּוֹסֶף] *mil'el*, on account of אל: cf. 2^{9} אל־תָּצַר, Ex. 23^{1} 2 S. 17^{16} (Dr. § 70).—בדבר] ב = *about* (6^{7} 11^{19} 1 S. 19^{3}): *Lex.* דָּבָר **4 c.**

Digitized by Google

with P.—*Go up unto the top of Pisgah*] on 34^{1}.—*Lift up thine eyes, &c.*] cf. Gen. 13^{14} (JE).—*This Jordan*] 31^{2} Jos. $1^{2.\,11}$ 4^{22} Gn. 32^{11}.—**28.** *But command* (צַו) *Joshua*] *i.e.* commission him, appoint him to his office: צִוָּה, as Is. 10^{6}; 1 S. 13^{14} 25^{30} (RV. "appoint"). The formal execution of the present direction is not narrated in Dt. (unless $31^{7f.}$, where Moses "encourages" Joshua, be intended as such): in $31^{14.\,23}$ (which belongs, moreover, to JE) it is Jehovah, not Moses, who "appoints" him to his office.—*Encourage him* (1^{38}), *and strengthen him*] cf. 31^{7} "Be courageous and strong" (addressed by Moses to Joshua); also 31^{23} Jos. $1^{6.\,7.\,9.\,18}$ 10^{25} (all D^2).—*Cause to inherit*] cf. (of Joshua) 1^{38} 31^{7} Jos. 1^{6}; also c. 12^{10} 19^{8} 21^{16} 32^{8} (the Song).

In P, Nu. $27^{12\text{-}14}$ is parallel to v.^{27} here, and Nu. $27^{15\text{-}21}$ to v.^{28}. The two narratives are, however, in the case of each incident, very differently conceived; and it is manifest that the one in Dt. is written without reference to that of Nu., the only word of any note common to both being "command" (v.^{28} Nu. $27^{19.\,23}$). P also—at least if Dt. $3^{18.\,21.\,23.\,29}$ be interpreted, in what seems to be their intended sense, as describing a series of events in chronological sequence—assigns both incidents to a different occasion, placing them, viz. *before* Nu. 32 (which corresponds to v.$^{13\text{-}20}$ here), instead of after it. It is true, in view of the somewhat vague expression *at that time* in v.^{23}, v.$^{23\text{-}28}$ might (in spite of the tense ואתחנן; see phil. n. on 1^{9}) be referred not unreasonably to an occasion a month or two earlier (1^{3} comp. with Nu. $20^{22\text{-}29}$ 33^{38}) than v.$^{18\text{-}22}$. But considering the relation which prevails in other cases between the narrative of P and those of Dt. and JE, a difference both in representation and occasion is not improbable. Comp. on 31^{14}.

29. *And we abode in the ravine in front of* (מוּל) *Beth-Pe'or*] the verse closes the retrospect which began with 1^{6}, and specifies, more closely than had been done in 1^{5}, the spot which the Israelites had now reached, and at which the discourses of Dt. were delivered (cf. 4^{46}). On "ravine" (גַּיְא), see *S. & P.* App. § 2. The "ravine" intended can hardly be the broad Jordan-valley (p. 3): it must rather have been one of the glens or defiles of the 'Abārim-range (32^{49}). Exactly the same terms are used in 34^{6} to describe the locality of Moses' grave.—*Beth-Pe'or*] 4^{46} 34^{6} Jos. 13^{20}, cf. Nu. 23^{28}.

The site is uncertain. Euseb. (*Onom.* p. 233) states that Βεθφογορ [on γ=ע, see below] was near mount Φογορ, opposite to Jericho, 6 miles above

---

28. כי הוא] *Lex.* הוא **1 a** (Jud. 14^{3} &c.).—**29.** פעור] 𝔊 Φογορ: cf. Γοθονιηλ, Γαζα, Γαι (=העי), Γαιβαλ (=עיבל), &c. (see on 1 S. 16^{20}).

Digitized by Google

Livias (=Tell-el-Rāmeh: *Survey of East. Pal.* p. 238); and mount Φογωρ (*Onom.* p. 213) is placed opposite to Jericho, on the road leading up from Livias to Ḥeshbon. If these statements are correct, Peʿor will have been one of the summits of the ʿAbārim range, very near to the Wady Hesbān. Conder (*PEFSt.* 1882, p. 85 f.; cf. *Heth and Moab*,[3] p. 146 f.) suggests a site further to the south, viz. the crest of a hill above ʿAin-el-Minyeh, 8 miles SW. of Nebo, commanding an extensive view of the lower valley of the Jordan (cf. Nu. 23^{28} 24^{2} 25^{1}). But Jos. 13^{20}, and Nu. 23^{28} compared with v.^{14}, both favour a site nearer Pisgah; and Nu. 25^{1-3} makes it probable that Peʿor was more readily accessible from the plain of Shiṭṭim (the Ghôr es-Seisebān) than ʿAin-el-Minyeh would be. Cf. on 34^{6}.

(2.) **IV. 1–40. Second part of Moses' first discourse.**—Exhortation to Israel, as the condition of its prosperity and national greatness, not to forget the great truths impressed upon it at Ḥoreb, especially the *spirituality* of Jehovah, and *His sole and exclusive Godhead.*

1–8. Exhortation to Israel to observe diligently the law now about to be set before it, as the condition of its greatness and wisdom in the eyes of the world.—1. *And now*] introducing the practical conclusion which the Writer desires to be drawn from the preceding retrospect: Israel, having been brought by Jehovah through the wilderness to the borders of the Promised Land (1^{6}–3^{29}), must now, on its part, respond to the duties laid upon it, if success and happiness are to attend it in its future home.—*Statutes and judgments*] the same combination (occasionally with *testimonies* or *commandments* prefixed), v.$^{5.\,8.\,14.\,45}$ $5^{1.\,28\,(31)}$ $6^{1.\,20}$ 7^{11} 11^{32} 12^{1} $26^{16.\,17}$ (also, with חקות for חקים, 8^{11} 11^{1} 30^{16}), as well as sometimes in other books, especially those dependent on Dt., as 1 K. 8^{58} 9^{4} 2 K. 17^{37}, and (with חקות for חקים) 1 K. 2^{3} 11^{33}. It is found also (with חקות) in H and Ez., but usually otherwise construed: Lev. $18^{4.\,5.\,26}$ 19^{37} 20^{22} 25^{18} $26^{15.\,43}$ Ez. $5^{6.\,7}$ 11^{20} 18^{9} &c.

The idea in חק is properly that of a *statute*, fixed by being *engraven* (חקק: Ez. 23^{14} Is. 49^{16} Job 19^{23}; Is. 10^{1}), or inscribed, on some durable surface; the idea in משפט is that of a *judicial decision*, made authoritatively once, and constituting a rule, or precedent, applicable to other similar cases in the future (cf. Ex. 21^{1}; Baentsch, *Das Bundesbuch*, 1892, pp. 29–34). "Judgments" being thus a term denoting primarily the provisions of the civil and criminal law, "statutes" may be taken to refer more particularly to positive institutions or enactments, whether moral, ceremonial, or civil (for instance, 7^{1-3}; c. 12; c. 14; c. 16; c. 17; &c.).

Digitized by Google

Israel] as a vocative; comp. on 5^{1}.—*Teach* (מְלַמֵּד)] lit. *am teaching*, viz. in the present series of discourses. For the term, cf. v.$^{5.\,10.\,14}$ $5^{28\,(31)}$ 6^{1} 11^{19}.—*That ye may live, &c.*] life, coupled with the secure possession of the Promised Land, is constantly held out in Dt. as the reward for obedience to God's commandments: cf. 5^{30} 6^{24} $30^{6.\,15\text{-}19}$ 32^{47a}, esp. 8^{1} 16^{20}; also 4^{40} 6^{2} 11^{21} 25^{15} 32^{47b}.—*Which Jehovah, the God of your fathers, is giving you*] on $1^{11.\,20}$.—**2.** *Ye shall not add unto the word which I am commanding you, neither shall ye diminish from it*] so 13^{1} (12^{32}): cf. Jer. 26^{2} Prov. 30^{6} Rev. $22^{18f.}$. The faithful observance of a body of precepts implies, on the one hand, that nothing is added to it, such as might for instance possess inferior authority, or have the effect of weakening or neutralizing any of the provisions contained in it; and, on the other, that nothing is taken from it for the purpose of accommodating it to the wilfulness, or infirmity, of human nature.—*Am commanding*] so v.^{40} 6^{6} 7^{11} 8^{11} 10^{13} and often.—**3–4.** In proof of the assertion that obedience brings with it life, the Writer appeals to Israel's recent experience at Baʿal-Peʿor.—**3.** *Your eyes are those that saw*] 3^{21}.—*In Baʿal-Peʿor*] Nu. $25^{1\text{-}5}$ (JE). On the rendering see below; and cf. Hos. 9^{10}.—*That went after Baʿal of Peʿor*] named besides Nu. $25^{3.\,5}$ (hence Ps. 106^{28}); cf. Nu. 25^{18} 31^{16} Jos. 22^{17} (all P). As there was a mountain named Peʿor (Nu. 23^{28}), and a locality Beth-Peʿor (on 3^{29}), Baʿal of Peʿor was no doubt the Baʿal worshipped on Peʿor with local rites.

Ba'als with local or other special attributes (cf. the pl. "the Ba'als," 1 S. 7^{4} Hos. 2^{15}) are often mentioned, both on Phœnician inscriptions (Ba'al of Ẓidon, Ba'al of Lebanon, Ba'al of Tarsus, Ba'al of heaven, בעל חמן the solar Ba'al, &c.: *vid.* on 1 S. 7^{4}; W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.* i. 93) and in the OT. (as Ba'al-zebub = Ba'al of flies, בעל ברית Jud. 8^{33} 9^{4}), sometimes even forming names of places (as Ba'al-Gad = Ba'al of fortune, Ba'al-Ẓephon, Ba'al-Me'on, Ba'al-Tamar). Ba'al of Pe'or appears to have been a deity worshipped by the Moabites (cf. Nu. $25^{1\text{-}5}$): but of the special attributes belonging to him,

---

IV. 1. למען תחיו . . . ובאתם] Dr. § 115 (*s.v.* למען); G-K. § 112. 3*c*, *a*.—וירשתם] G-K. § 44. 2 R.[2]—**3.** בבעל פעור] "*in*" rather than "*because of* B." (the cases *Lex.* ב **III. 5** being hardly parallel): "did because of" would have been rather עשה מִפְּנֵי (Jer. 7^{12} 9^{6} *al.*). Hos. 9^{10} the syntax shows that בעל פעור (after a verb of *motion*) must be likewise the name of a locality.—כל האיש] a *casus pendens*: cf. on 2^{23}, and G-K. § 116. 5 R.[5], Dr. § 121 *n.*

Digitized by Google

or the nature of the rites observed in his honour, nothing is really known. It is possible that he was a god of fruitfulness and fertility, though the terms of Nu. 25^{1-3} are hardly such as to authorize the definite conclusion that the whoredom with the daughters of Moab was connected with his rites (v.^{2} "For," RV., should be simply "And"). The Christian Fathers and Jewish Rabbis have both much to say respecting the repulsive character of his worship (see the passages collected by Selden, *De Dis Syriis*, i. 5); their statements, however, do not appear to rest upon independent tradition, but are based upon questionable etymologies of the name Pe'or, or uncertain inferences either from the text of Nu. $25^{1ff.}$ or from 𝔊's rendering ἐτελέσθη for נצמד Nu. 25^{3}. The idea that Ba'al of Pe'or was the Priapus of Moab is thus very insufficiently established (so Selden). The derivation of פעור is unknown: in Hebrew, פער means *to open wide* (of the mouth, Is. 5^{14} Job 16^{10} 29^{23} Ps. 119^{131}†); פְּעָרָא in Syriac is *a hollow* or *cavern* of the earth (Heb. 11^{38} = ὀπαί); and the place פעור may have received its name from some circumstance connected with its position or geographical character (note ראש הפעור, with the art., Nu. 23^{28}). See further Kautzsch und Socin, *Die Aechtheit der Moab. Alterthümer geprüft* (1876), pp. 71–75; Baethgen, *Sem. Rel.-gesch.* p. 14 f.; Dillm. on Nu. 25^{3}.

4. *But ye that did cleave, &c.*] the duty of "cleaving" to God, in loyal and close devotion, is elsewhere insisted on in Dt.: 10^{20} 11^{22} $13^{5(4)}$ 30^{20}; hence in D^{2} Jos. 22^{5} 23^{8}: cf. 2 K. 18^{6} (of devotion to idolatry, *ib.* 3^{3}).—5–6. The statutes which Moses has taught the people have God as their author: hence, if they are followed obediently, the heathen themselves will be constrained to confess that Israel is a nation of singular insight and wisdom.—5. *See* (רְאֵה)] 1^{8}.—*I have taught you, &c.*] the systematic "exposition" (1^{5}) of the body of law contained in Dt. was not the beginning of Moses' legislative work; already at Horeb he had received "statutes and judgments," which, during the years that had since elapsed, he had, as occasion arose, impressed upon his people (cf. v.^{14}, and on $5^{29(32)}$).—*Whither ye are going in to possess it*] 7^{1} $11^{10.29}$ $23^{21(20)}$ $28^{21.63}$ 30^{16}, cf. 12^{29}.—6. *Observe and do*] 7^{12} 16^{12} $23^{24(23)}$ 24^{8} 26^{16} 28^{13}, cf. $29^{8(9)}$ Jos. 23^{6} (D^{2}); the more usual expression in Dt. is "observe *to* do"; see Intr. § 5.—*For that is your wisdom, &c.*] obedience to such laws will be public evidence of your wisdom in the eyes of the world.—*Which shall hear of all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people!*] the sight of Israel's national greatness will attract the attention of heathen nations, and combined with a knowledge of the laws to which it is due, will evoke their admiration of

Digitized by Google

the wisdom which has secured Israel's cheerful obedience to them.—**7–8.** Israel's wisdom in obeying its laws, and at the same time the admiration of the nations, are further justified by two additional considerations: (1) no other great nation has so nearly risen to the religious ideal of humanity, no other nation has the consciousness which Israel enjoys, of having its God ever nigh at hand, and ready to succour it; (2) no other great nation possesses a body of law in itself so *righteous*, i.e. so conformable to the requirements of justice and right, and consequently so adapted to command the admiration of mankind at large, as Israel has.—**7.** *That hath gods* (or *God*) *so nigh unto it, &c.*] the Heb. is ambiguous: but the rendering *gods* appears to be the most probable: comp. below.—*Nigh unto it*] cf. Ps. 34^{19} 145^{18}.—**8.** *All this law*] on 1^{5}.—*Set before you* (נתן לפניכם)] *i.e.* offer for your acceptance or choice; so $11^{26.\,32}$ $30^{1.\,15.\,19}$: in a different sense from 1^{8}.—**8.** *To-day*] of the day on which the Deut. legislation is expounded: so v.[40] 5^{1} 6^{6} 7^{11} $8^{1.\,11}$ 11^{8}, and often.

9–24. The primary and fundamental principle of the entire law, viz. the spirituality of Jehovah and His transcendence above all created objects; and the correlative duty of resisting steadily every temptation to idolatry.—9–12. The spirituality of Jehovah.—**9.** *Only*] the restrictive particle introduces with emphasis the particular precept of the law on which the legislator desires to lay especial stress.—*Take heed to thyself*] (הִשָּׁמֶר־לְךָ)] a favourite Deuteronomic expression, v.[23] 6^{12} 8^{11} 11^{16} $12^{13.\,19.\,30}$ 15^{9} (cf. 24^{8}); comp. וְנִשְׁמַרְתֶּם מְאֹד 2^{4} 4^{15} Jos. 23^{11} (D²). So in JE, in a similar connexion, Ex. 34^{12} (also, though

7. קרבים] אלהים, construed with a plur. adj. (or verb) may (1) be a true numerical plural, signifying *gods* (6^{14} and often); or (2) may (chiefly in the mouth of, or in conversation with, heathen) be a vague designation of supernatural beings—whether the true God be *meant* by the speaker or not (as Gen. 20^{13} Ex. 32^{1} [*v.* Dillm.] 1 S. 4^{8} 1 K. 19^{2}; Ew. § 318ª; G-K. § 145. 3 R.); or (3) may denote Jehovah, the pl. being a "plural of majesty" (G-K. § 124. 1ᶜ R.), as 5^{23} (2 and 3 are both rare). There is nothing to suggest the use of the plur. of majesty here; hence (the reference being to heathen nations) *gods* is probably the correct rendering (though, naturally, the proximity to a nation of a deity other than Jehovah would, in the eyes of the Writer, have had no significance, or indeed reality).—בכל קראנו] כל with the inf. is rare: 1 K. 8^{52} (Deut.) בכל קראם אליך; Gen. 30^{41} 1 Ch. 23^{31}.

Digitized by Google

less characteristically, Gn. 24^{6} $31^{24.\,29}$ Ex. 10^{28} 19^{12}).—*Keep thy soul*] pathetically for *keep thyself*, with the implication of avoiding some personal danger or misfortune: cf. Pr. 13^{3} 16^{17} 19^{16} where the שֹׁמֵר נַפְשׁוֹ, "he that keepeth his soul," is opposed to one who incurs ruin or even death.—*Which thine eyes saw*] the same emphatic expression 7^{19} 10^{21} 29^{2}.—*Depart from thy heart*] *i.e.* vanish from thy mind and memory. The *heart*, in Hebrew psychology, is the seat of intelligence (on v.[29]); here, in particular, of intelligent memory.—*All the days of thy life*] 6^{2} 16^{3} 17^{19}.—*And make them known unto thy children, &c.*] cf. $6^{7.\,20f.}$ 11^{19} 31^{13} 32^{46}; also Ex. $12^{26f.}$ $13^{8.\,14}$ Jos. $4^{21f.}$.—**10.** *The day that thou stoodest, &c.*] in loose apposition to *the things*, v.[9]: the memory of that eventful occasion is to be kept alive through successive generations.—*That they may learn to fear me*] comp. Ex. 19^{9} 20^{20} (JE): for the phrase, cf. 14^{23} 17^{19} 31^{13}. —*All the days, &c.*] 12^{1} 31^{13}.—*And that they may teach their children*] viz. to fear me likewise.—**11.** *And ye came near, &c.*] Ex. 19^{17b}.—*And the mountain burned with fire, &c.*] Ex. 19^{18} $20^{18.\,21b}$ (E); cf. $24^{16f.}$ (P).—**12.** *And Jehovah spake*] Ex. 19^{19} $20^{1.\,19}$; also Dt. $5^{4f.}$.—*Out of the midst of the fire*] the same fact is emphasized, in the same words, v.[15. 33. 36] $5^{4.\,21.\,23}$ 9^{10} 10^{4}.—*Ye saw no form, save* (that there was) *a voice*] the stress lies on the fact that, though God revealed Himself by the sound of words, *no form*, no material, or even quasi-material, figure was seen: there was nothing to suggest a material presence of the Almighty. תמונה (see below) is *form, semblance, shape*, even one of the most impalpable kind. Men of spiritual mind, who are under no temptation to conceive, or represent,

10. יום אשר] on 1^{31}.—אשר ילמדון] see on v.[40].—ואת בניהם ילמדון] the change of order introduces variety, and forms a more forcible termination to the sentence than the plain וְלִמְּדוּ את בניהם: cf. Lev. 25^{41b} 26^{42}.—**11.** עַד לב השמים] לב *heart*, fig. for *centre, midst*: Ex. 15^{8} Ez. 27^{27} 2 S. 18^{14}.—חשך ענן וערפל] "(with) *darkness, cloud*," &c. Implicit accusatives, defining the manner, or attendant circumstances, of the mountain's burning: cf. Ew. § 300^{c}, Ges. § 118. 5^{c}.—**12.** אתם שמעים . . . אינכם ראים] the participles represent the scene as *continuing*, and depict it more graphically and vividly than the mere perfects would have done (Dr. § 135. 1).—תמונה] *form, semblance*, εἶδος, *species* (the root is preserved apparently in the Arab. *mâna*, mentitus fuit, Eth. *mêna*, dolo uti, prop. falsam speciem præ se ferre); as here, v.[15]; Job 4^{16} of a nocturnal apparition, whose presence could be felt, but whose

Digitized by Google

the Deity as material, may enjoy (Nu. 12^{8}), or hope to enjoy (Ps. 17^{15}), the privilege of beholding Jehovah's "form": but no "form" was seen by the Israelites at Ḥoreb; there was nothing, therefore, as is drawn out more fully v.$^{15ff.}$, to justify them in constructing a material representation of the Godhead.

13–14. A brief notice of the commands then laid upon the people by Jehovah. These verses, speaking strictly, are of the nature of a digression: for the subject of this part of the chapter is not the *substance*, but the *mode*, of the revelation at Ḥoreb.—**13.** *His covenant*] the most formal and, so to say, official expression of the gracious relation subsisting between Jehovah and His people Israel.

The term is borrowed from the popular language. The maintenance of friendly relations between nations, or individuals, is guaranteed by the establishment of a solemn compact, or agreement between them, called technically a *covenant* (Gn. 21^{32} 1 S. $18^{3f.}$ 20^{8} 1 K. 20^{34}). The conclusion of a covenant, at least on important occasions, was accompanied by religious ceremonies: a sacrificial feast was held (Gn. $26^{28.30}$ $31^{46.54}$); and a calf or other animal having been slain, and its divided parts placed opposite to each other, the contracting parties passed between them, invoking upon themselves, in case either should violate the terms of the agreement, a fate similar to that of the slaughtered victim (Gn. $15^{9-11.17}$;[1] Jer. $34^{18f.}$: cf. *Il.* iii. 298): hence the idiom, common to Hebrew with the classical languages, *to cut* or *strike a covenant* (כרת ברית; *ὅρκια τέμνειν*; *icere fœdus*). The terms, or conditions, on the basis of which the covenant is concluded, consist naturally of mutual promises and obligations: these are called in Ex. 24^{8} $34^{27f.}$ "the words of the covenant," the document reciting them being "the book of the covenant," Ex. 24^{7}. The theocratic application of the term is found first in JE (Ex. 19^{5a} $24^{7.8}$; cf. $34^{10.27}$), where the thought is expressed that if Israel, on its part, observes the conditions laid down in the terms of the covenant, Jehovah, on His part, will bestow certain specified blessings (Ex. 19^{5b-6}; 23^{22-33}) upon it. This theological sense is rare in early writers (Hos. 6^{7} 8^{1}: never in Amos or

---

contour could not be distinctly descried (ולא אביר מראהו); Nu. 12^{8} (ותמונת יהוה יביט), of the intangible, yet quasi-sensual manifestation of the Godhead vouchsafed to Moses, as contrasted with the less distinct manifestation by the vision, or the dream (v.^{6}), which might need interpretation (cf. לא בחידות v.^{8}), granted to other prophets; Ps. 17^{15} (אשבעה בהקיץ תמונתך) of the immaterial, yet real and objectively perceptible, presence of Jehovah, to which the Psalmist aspires to be admitted (‖ אחזה פניך). In Dt. $4^{16.23.25}$ 5^{8} (= Ex. 20^{4}) ת׳ denotes that in which the copy of an object resembles the original, *i.e.* its *shape*, *figure* †.—**12.** זולתי] 1 K. 3^{18}: *v. Lex.*—**13.** לחות אבנים] the same double plural 5^{19} $9^{9.10.11}$ $10^{1.3}$ (= Ex. $34^{1.4a}$) 1 K. 8^{9} Ex. 34^{4b}: *v.* G-K. § 124. 2*b*.

Digitized by Google

Isaiah); but it is prominent in Dt. and writers influenced by it (D^2 in Jos.; compilers of Judges and Kings; Jeremiah); it occurs also not unfrequently in later prophets (*e.g.* Ezek. and II Isaiah); and it is used characteristically in several special applications by P. In references to the covenant, the stress may naturally lie, according to the context and the purpose of the writer, either on the Divine *promise*, or the human *obligation*, of which it is the guarantee. In JE Jehovah concludes a solemn covenant with Abraham (Gn. 15^{18}), promising his descendants the possession of Canaan. The covenant most frequently referred to in the OT. is, however, that concluded with Israel at Sinai (Ex. $24^{7.8}$ $34^{10.27}$). The terms of this covenant, in so far as they are obligatory upon Israel, are embodied most succinctly in the Decalogue, which is accordingly in the present passage (and perhaps already in Ex. 34^{28}) identified with it; the stones on which the Decalogue was engraved are "the tables of the covenant" (Dt. $9^{9.11.15}$ 1 K. 8^9 𝔊); and the ark which contained them is "the ark of Jehovah's covenant," 10^8 (see note), cf. 1 K. 8^{21} (Deut.).

The other references in Dt. to the covenant of Ḥoreb are: (as imposing obligations upon Israel) 4^{23} $5^{2.3}$ (followed by the Decalogue) 17^2 29^{1b} $31^{16.20}$, cf. 33^9; (as involving on Jehovah's part the observance of His promise) 7^9; in 4^{31} 7^{12} 8^{18} the covenant with Abraham (Gn. 15^{18}), extended, on the basis of Gn. $22^{16f.}$ $26^{3f.}$ &c., to the other patriarchs, is appealed to as a guarantee of God's faithfulness. In $29^{1a.9.12.14.20}$ the legislation of Dt. is made the basis of a covenant, entered into by Jehovah with Israel in the land of Moab, a renewal, as it were, of that concluded at Ḥoreb. The particular duty on which the observance or neglect of the covenant is in Dt. principally made to turn, is (in accordance with what is a primary aim of the book) loyalty to Jehovah, as opposed to all false gods (notice the context of the passages cited). Later prophets and historical writers (esp. those influenced by Dt.) often recall Israel to the duty of observing the covenant, and declare the consequences of neglecting it; as Jos. $7^{11.15}$ 23^{16} Jud. 2^{20} 1 K. 11^{11} $19^{10.14}$ 2 K. $17^{15.35.38}$ 18^{12} $23^{2.3.21}$ (the basis of Josiah's reformation), Jer. 11^{2-10} 22^9 31^{32b} $34^{13f.}$ (see Dt. 15^{13}); as a motive of God's favour or clemency, 1 K. 8^{23} 2 K. 13^{23} Jer. 14^{21}. And in pictures of the ideal, or Messianic, future, the establishment of a new covenant between Jehovah and His people is promised, Jer. 31^{31-33} 32^{40} 50^5 Ez. $16^{60.62}$ 34^{25} 37^{26} Is. 54^{10} 55^3 59^{21} 61^8 (cf. 42^6 49^8). In the Priests' Code, the idea of the covenant is extended, and it is applied to many particular institutions of the theocracy; but a further discussion of this subject would be out of place here, and it must suffice to refer to Schultz, *OT. Theology*, p. 401 ff. (E.T. ii. 1 ff.); and J. J. P. Valeton's elaborate study on the usage of ברית in different parts of the OT., *ZATW*. 1892, pp. 1 ff., 224 ff., 1893, p. 245 ff.

(Even) *the ten words*] *i.e.* the "Decalogue" (Ex. $20^{1ff.}$). So 10^4, and (perhaps) Ex. 34^{28b}.—*Upon two tables of stone*] Ex. 24^{12} 31^{18b}: cf. Dt. 9^{10} 10^4.—**14.** *And me* (emph.) *did Jehovah command, &c.*] Moses was commissioned further at the same time

14. ואתי] *and me* (emph.), opp. to *you*, v.[13]. Cf. for the position אתכם v.[20] (opp. to the nations, v.[19]), 6^{23} Lev. 11^{33b} (opp. to כל אשר בתוכו), 26^{33} Ez.

Digitized by Google

to instruct the people in the laws which were to regulate their life in Canaan: cf. v.^{5} 1^{18} 5$^{28\,(31)}$. The reference, it seems, is partly to the body of law comprised in the "Book of the Covenant," Ex. 20^{22}–23^{33} (cf. Ex. 24$^{3.\,7b.\,8}$), partly (above, v.^{5}) to the laws constituting the code of Dt.—*Whither ye are going over to possess it*] 6^{1} 11$^{8.\,11}$: cf. on v.^{26}.

15–19. Let Israel, then, take to heart the lesson of Ḥoreb, and resist strenuously the temptation to worship any material or created object, in particular either (*a*) any representation of the human or animal form, or (*b*) the host of heaven.—**15.** *Take good heed, then, to yourselves* (ונשמרתם מאד לנפשתיכם)] so Jos. 23^{11} (D^{2}): comp. on v.^{9}.—*For ye saw no manner of form, &c.*] resumption of v.^{12} (after the digression of v.$^{13\text{-}14}$), as the foundation of the following exhortation.—**16.** *Lest ye deal corruptly* (תַּשְׁחִתוּן)] v.^{25} 31^{29}: cf. שִׁחֵת 9^{12} (from Ex. 32^{7}).—*A graven image*, (even) *a form of*—*i.e.* constituted by—*any statue* (סֶמֶל)] סֶמֶל Ez. 8$^{3.\,5}$ 2 Ch. 33^{7}†: in Phœnician (see below) = ἀνδριάς, *statue*.—*The likeness* (תַּבְנִית) *of male or female*] with allusion to male and female deities. תַּבְנִית *model* or *likeness* (lit. *construction*, from בנה *to build*), as Ps. 106^{20}, and esp. Ez. 8^{10}.—**17–18.** *The likeness of any beast that is in the earth, &c.*] the prohibition is worded as generally as possible: no representation of beast, bird, reptile, or fish is to be made for purposes of worship (comp. Ez. 8^{10}).

12^{13b} 23^{10} ואותה (opp. to בניה ובנותיה); cf. on 1^{38}.—**15.** ונשמרתם] the pf. with the *waw* consec. with the force of an imper., "take heed, then," "so take heed" (Dr. § 119δ), as often in this book, *e.g.* 7^{9} 8^{5} 10$^{16.\,19}$ 11^{8} 30^{19}.—דִּבֶּר] a rel. clause, with אשר unexpressed, after ביום (in the *st. c.*); so Ex. 6^{28} Lev. 7^{35} Nu. 3^{1} 2 S. 22^{1} (=Ps. 18^{1}), cf. Hos. 1^{2} (. . . תְּחִלַּת דִּבֶּר); G-K. § 130. 4. The supposition (König, i. 191, 212, 309) that דִּבֶּר &c. are anomalous forms of the inf. c., is not necessary or probable, in view of passages such as Ps. 90^{15} 138^{3} Job 29^{2}, where this explanation is evidently not admissible. At the same time, as ביום is construed far more frequently with an inf. (Gn. 2^{4} 5^{1} Lev. 7$^{16.\,36.\,38}$ &c.), it is very possible that the Mass. punctuation is not correct, and that the original pronunciation was דַּבֵּר, הַקְרִיב, הַצִּיל. Comp. on 3^{3} 7^{24}.—**16.** פן תשחיתון ועשיתם] so v.^{19} 8$^{12\text{-}17}$ 15^{9} &c. (Dr. § 115, *s.v.* פן; G-K. § 112. 3*c* α).—פסל וג׳] cf. on 5^{8}.—סמל] in Phœn. cf. *CIS.* I. i. 41^{1} 88$^{2.\,5}$ 91^{1} כסמל או אש יתן מלכיתן מלך כתי this statue, which Milkyathon, king of Kiti (Kition, in Cyprus), gave, 93^{3} הסמלם האל these statues (הַסְּמָלִם); and סמלת (fem.) 11^{2}.—**17.** צפור כנף] "fowl of wing": so Gn. 7^{14} (P) Ps. 148^{10}: cf. (כל) צפור כל כנף Ez. 17^{23} 39$^{4.\,17}$.—תעוף] the impf. as 2^{20}.

Digitized by Google

On the worship of animals, comp. Ez. $8^{10f.}$; W. R. Smith, "Animal Worship and Animal Tribes among the Arabs and in the OT." in the *Journal of Philology*, ix. (1880), p. 75 ff., and *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* (1885), chap. vii. (on Totemism, and tribes named from animals), with the criticisms of Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* 1886, pp. 157–169, and Wellhausen, *Reste Arabischen Heidentumes*, p. 176 f.; the same writer's *Religion of the Semites*, i. pp. 160, 270–293; J. G. Frazer, *Totemism* (1887).

18. *Of anything that creepeth in the ground*] *i.e.* reptiles, quadrupeds being denoted by בהמה (cf. Gn. 6^{7} 8^{17} 1 K. 5^{13}). So Gn. 1^{30} כל רֹמֵשׂ על הארץ, 1^{26} 7^{8}.—*That is in the water under the earth*] so Ex. 20^{4} (= Dt. 5^{8}). The subterranean waters, on which the land was supposed to rest, the source of springs and rivers, are intended: Gn. 7^{11} Ez. 31^{4} Ps. 24^{2} 136^{6}.—**19.** *The sun and the moon and the stars*, (even) *all the host of heaven*] cf. 17^{3}. Next to image-worship, the veneration of the host of heaven is mentioned as that form of idolatry into which the Israelite of the Writer's day might most readily fall. It is alluded to frequently in the period of the later kings: 2 K. 17^{16} $21^{3.5}$ $23^{4.5.12}$ Zeph. 1^{5} Jer. 8^{2} 19^{13}; 7^{18} 44^{17}; Ez. 8^{16}. "The seductive character of this worship, the influence exerted upon the ancient mind by the beauty of the heavenly bodies, by their wonderful but inexplicable movements, and by their varied effects upon the world, is picturesquely indicated by the phrase employed by the Writer, 'Lest thou *lift up thine eyes to heaven, and see* the sun, &c., and be drawn away, and worship them': cf. Job $31^{26f.}$" (Dillm.).—*Drawn away* (נִדַּח)] so 30^{17}; and (actively) $13^{6.11.14\,(5.10.13)}$ 2 K. 17^{21} Qrê 2 Ch. 21^{11}.—*Bow down* (*worship*) *and serve*] 5^{9} (= Ex. 20^{5}) 30^{17}; (in inverted order) 8^{19} 11^{16} 17^{3} 29^{25}.—*Which Jehovah thy God hath allotted to all the peoples*] viz. to be worshipped by them; cf. $29^{25\,(26)}$ "other gods. . . . whom *He had not allotted to them* (the Israelites)." So Just. Mart. *c. Tryph.* §§ 55, 121; Clem. Al. *Strom.* vi. 14, 110 f.; Schultz, Keil, Dillm. &c. The God of Israel is supreme: He assigns to every nation its objects of worship; and the veneration of the heavenly bodies by the nations (other than Israel) forms part of His providential order of the world. Natural religion, though it may become depraved (Rom. $1^{21ff.}$), is a witness to some of the deepest needs and instincts of humanity: in default of a purer and higher faith, the yearnings of mankind

Digitized by Google

after a power higher than themselves find legitimate satisfaction in it. Clem. Al. (*l.c.*) even views the worship of the heavenly bodies as granted to the nations ἵνα μὴ τέλεον ἄθεοι γενόμενοι τελέως καὶ διαφθαρῶσιν; and as the appointed means of enabling them to rise ultimately to something better (ὁδὸς γὰρ αὕτη δοθεῖσα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀνακῦψαι πρὸς θεόν). The explanation (𝔙; Rashi, *al.;* cf. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 444), according to which the heavenly bodies were "allotted" to the nations, to minister to their needs and comforts, is inconsistent with the context, besides being inapplicable to the parallel passage $29^{25 (26)}$.—*Under the whole heaven*] 2^{25}.—**20.** *But you* (emph.) *hath Jehovah taken, &c.*] Israel, however, unlike the heathen nations, has no share in such deities: it has been chosen by Jehovah as His peculiar possession; and it is accordingly bound to render Him exclusive service.—*Iron-furnace*] i.e. furnace for smelting iron, fig. of a severe and searching ordeal (cf. כּוּר עֳנִי *furnace of affliction*, Is. 48^{10}): of Egypt, as here, 1 K. 8^{51} (Deut.) Jer. 11^{4}†.—*A people of inheritance*] cf. "to be a people of special possession," 7^{6} 14^{2}, where, as here, the special relation subsisting between Israel and Jehovah is made a ground for Israel's discarding all heathen rites and practices, and reserving its exclusive allegiance for Jehovah.—*As at this day*] 2^{30}.—**21.** *But Jehovah was angered with me, &c.*] 1^{37} (*q.v.*) 3^{26}. Moses himself, however, had incurred Jehovah's displeasure, and had been forbidden in consequence to enter the Promised Land, so that he could not participate fully in the privileges of the עַם נַחֲלָה: let Israel, then, take heed, lest by lapsing into idolatry they kindle God's wrath against them, and move Him to withdraw His favour.—*The good land*] 1^{35}.—*Which Jehovah thy God is giving to thee as an inheritance*] 15^{4} 19^{10} 20^{16} 21^{23} 24^{4} 25^{19} 26^{1}.—**23.** The exhortation of v.$^{15ff.}$ is reiterated, after the fresh considerations advanced in v.$^{20-22}$.

21. ולבלתי בא] perh. (in view of עֹבֵר just before) בֹּאִי should be restored; yet cf. 17^{20}. Other isolated cases occur of the omission of a suff. with the inf., where it might be expected, not only where the subj. is indef. (as 1 S. 11^{2}), but also besides, as Gn. 19^{29b} 24^{30} 25^{26} Ex. 13^{21b} Jos. 8^{19} 1 K. 20^{12} Jer. 7^{22} Kt. 27^{10} (contrast ^{15}) $41^{4.6b}$ 1 Ch. 21^{15}.—**22.** אנכי מת] idiom., as Gn. 48^{21} $50^{5.24}$, מת אתה Is. 38^{1}. The ptcp., as 2^{4} &c., of the imminent future (G-K. § 116. 5*c*; Dr. § 135. 3): so אינני עובר (cf. Ex. 5^{10}; Gn. 20^{7} 43^{5}).

Digitized by Google

—*A graven image*, (even) *the form of anything which Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee* (not to make)] cf. v.$^{16.\ 25}$. צִוָּה *commanded*, in a negative sense, as 2^{37}.—**24.** An emphatic declaration of the ultimate ground of the preceding warnings: Jehovah is *a devouring fire*, consuming and destroying those who set themselves to dishonour Him or thwart His will (9^{3}; cf. Is. 29^{6} $30^{27.\ 30}$; also Ex. 24^{17}); He is likewise *a jealous God*, who will not endure that the honour which is His due should be rendered to a false god (cf. 32^{21} Is. 42^{8}), and who visits those who slight Him with the fire of His vengeance (cf. Zeph. 1^{18} 3^{8} Ez. 36^{5} Ps. 79^{5}).—*A jealous God* (אֵל קַנָּא), as 5^{9} (= Ex. 20^{5}) 6^{15} Ex. 34^{14}†: cf. אֵל קַנּוֹא Jos. 24^{19} Nah. 1^{2}†.

25–31. Israel, in after-times, if it lapses into idolatry, will find itself exiled from its land; though even then God's mercy will not forsake His people, if it turns to Him in true penitence.—**25.** *And ye be grown old* (וְנוֹשַׁנְתֶּם) *in the land*] the word (which is a rare one) implies "the loss of spiritual freshness, and the blunting of original impressions, produced by force of custom, or long residence in the same spot" (Dillm.): comp. the use of the root, Lev. 13^{11} 25^{22} 26^{10}.—*A graven image*, (even) *the form of anything*] v.^{23}.—*And do that which is evil in the eyes of Jehovah*] 9^{18} 17^{2} 31^{29}: cf. on 6^{18}.—*To vex him* (לְהכעיסו)] so 9^{18} 31^{29} $32^{16.\ 21a}$ (כִּעֵס). Not "to provoke Him *to anger*" (AV., RV.): הִכְעִיס, and the cognate substantive כַּעַס (in Job כַּעַשׂ), express always the idea, not of *anger*, but of *chagrin*, or *vexation* (Job 5^{2} 6^{1}), caused by some unmerited treatment,—here, by deserting Jehovah, after the gracious and condescending regard which He had manifested towards Israel (v.^{20}), in favour of other gods. The word is used frequently in the same connexion by Deut. writers, as Jud. 2^{10}, and especially by the compiler of Kings (1 K. $14^{9.\ 15}$ 15^{30} $16^{2.\ 7.\ 13.\ 26.\ 33}$ 21^{22} 22^{54} 2 K. $17^{11.\ 17}$ $21^{6.\ 15}$ 22^{17} $23^{19.\ 26}$) and Jeremiah ($7^{18.\ 19}$ 8^{19} 11^{17} $25^{6.\ 7}$ $32^{29.\ 30.\ 32}$ $44^{3.\ 8}$); and occurs occasionally besides.—**26.** *I call heaven and earth to witness, &c.*] heaven and earth, representing the unchangeable and ever-present fabric of the universe, are solemnly appealed to (30^{19} 31^{28}) as witnesses of the fact that the

24. כי י׳ אלהיך אש אכלה הוא] contrast the different position of הוא 3^{22}; and see on 1^{17}.—**27.** מתי מספר] constr. as חלוצים 3^{18}.—ינהג] 28^{37} Gn. 31^{26}.

Digitized by Google

consequences of Israel's disobedience have thus been foretold to it (cf. 8^{19} $30^{17f.}$).—*Perish quickly*] cf. 7^{4} 11^{17} 28^{20} Jos. 23^{16} (D^{2}). —*Whereunto, &c.*] 31^{13} 32^{47}, cf. 30^{18}.—*Ye shall not prolong days* (לא תאריכן ימים) *upon it*] a favourite Deuteronomic expression: v.^{40} $5^{30\,(33)}$ 11^{9} 17^{20} 22^{7} 30^{18} 32^{47} (rare besides): cf. *that thy days may be prolonged* (למען יאריכו(ן) ימיך) 5^{16} (= Ex. 20^{12}) 6^{2} 25^{15}†.—**27–28.** They will be scattered among the nations, and dwindle in numbers; there also they will sink deeper in heathenism, until they become abandoned entirely to the worship of dumb idols.—**28.** *The work of men's hands*] 2 K. 19^{18} (= Is. 37^{19}, cf. 2 Ch. 32^{19}) Ps. 115^{4} 135^{15}; similarly c. 27^{15} Jer. 10^{3} (מעשה ידי חרש); Hos. $14^{4\,(3)}$ Is. 2^{8} 17^{8} Mic. $5^{12\,(13)}$. *Wood and stone*, as $28^{36.\,64}$ 29^{16} Ez. 20^{32}: as here, both phrases together, 2 K. 19^{18} (Deut.) = Is. 37^{19}.—*Which see not, and hear not, &c.*] hence (with variations) Ps. $115^{5\text{-}7}$ $135^{16\text{-}17}$. The same sarcasm on idols, made by the hands of men, and not even capable of the functions of animal life, also Hos. 8^{6} 13^{2} Is. $2^{8.\,20}$ 17^{8} 30^{22} Hab. $2^{18f.}$ Jer. $10^{1\text{-}10.\,14\text{-}15}$ (= $51^{17\text{-}18}$) Is. $44^{9\text{-}20}$ $46^{6f.}$ (cf. $40^{19f.}$ 41^{7} 48^{5}): elsewhere in the Pent. only Lev. 26^{30} (the פגרי גלליכם).

29–31. But Israel's alienation from its God will not be permanent. Tribulation will work a change in the heart of the nation; it will turn sincerely to Jehovah, and its penitence being accepted, will receive again the tokens of His favour.—**29.** *But from thence ye will seek Jehovah thy God; and thou shalt find him*] *i.e.* experience again His grace and help: cf. Ps. 32^{6} Is. 55^{6} 65^{1} 1 Ch. 28^{9b} 2 Ch. $15^{2.\,4}$, and esp. Jer. 29^{13} (where the agreement is almost verbal).—*Provided thou search after him with all thy heart, &c.*] the words express the condition of Jehovah's being "found," His being sought for, viz. not from superficial or interested motives, such as the desire to escape from misfortune, but with a radical change of heart (v.^{30} "return"), and the devotion of the whole being. The phrase "with all the heart, and with all the soul," is characteristic of Dt. (see on 6^{5}), and a genuine expression of the spirit which animates the Writer. It denotes (substantially) the entire spiritual being of man, the "heart" being, in the psychology of the ancient Hebrews, the organ of intellect (see Jer. 5^{21} Hos. 7^{11}

28. Notice the fourfold emphatic ין (1^{17}).

Digitized by Google

RV. *m.*; Job 12^{24}, &c.), and the "soul" being the organ of the desires or affections (on 24^{15}).—**30.** *All these things*] *i.e.* the tribulation just referred to, and implied v.$^{26f.}$.—*In the latter days*] lit. *in the end of the days* (באחרית הימים), an expression of rather frequent occurrence in the prophetical books, and denoting the final period of the future so far as it falls within the range of the speaker's perspective. The sense attaching to it is thus relative, not absolute, varying with the context. Here it is used of the period of Israel's return to God, forming the close of its history so far as contemplated by the writer; 31^{29} it is used of the antecedent period of Israel's rebellion: in Gn. 49^{1} of the period of Israel's possession of Canaan; in Nu. 24^{14} of the period of Israel's future conquest of Moab and Edom (see v.$^{17-18}$); in Ez. 38^{16} of the imagined period of Gog's attack upon restored Israel; in Dan. 10^{14} of the age of Antiochus Epiphanes. Elsewhere it is used of the ideal, or Messianic age, conceived as following at the close of the existing order of things, Hos. 3^{5} Is. 2^{2} (=Mic. 4^{1}); comp. Jer. 23^{20} (=30^{24}) 48^{47} 49^{39} Dan. 2^{28}†.—*Return even unto* (עד) *Jehovah*] 30^{2} Hos. $14^{2\,(1)}$ Am. 4^{6} Is. $9^{12\,(13)}$ 19^{22} *al.*; with אל 1 S. 7^{3} 1 K. $8^{33.\,48}$ *al.*—*And hearken to his voice* (ושמעת בקולו)] so 8^{20} 9^{23} $13^{5.\,19}$ 15^{5} $26^{14.\,17}$ 27^{10} $28^{1.\,2.\,15.\,45.\,62}$ $30^{2.\,8.\,10.\,20}$; Gn. 22^{18} 26^{5} Ex. 5^{2} 15^{26} (לְ) 19^{5} $23^{21.\,22}$ Nu. 14^{22} (all JE); Jos. 5^{6} 22^{2} (Joshua's) 24^{24}: elsewhere chiefly in Jer., and other writers influenced by Dt. (not Is. or Ez.).—**31.** *For Jehovah thy God is a compassionate God*] who is ready, therefore, to accept Israel's penitence, provided it be sincere (30^{3}). אֵל רַחוּם, as Ex. 34^{6} (JE).—*He will not let thee drop* (לֹא יַרְפְּךָ)] or, leave thee to sink down slack

30. בַּצַּר לְךָ] צַר לְ, יֵצַר לְ are both frequent; but this phrase recurs only Hos. 5^{15} Is. 25^{4} Ps. 18^{7} (=2 S. 22^{7}) 66^{14} 106^{44} $107^{6.\,13.\,19.\,28}$ 2 Ch. 15^{4}. No doubt originally בצר was intended as the infinitive of צר, and pronounced therefore בְּצַר (cf. שַׁךְ Jer. 5^{26}) or בְּצֹר (cf. קְרֹב לְ, כְּטוֹב לְ Hos. 10^{1}, לְטוֹב לְ Dt. 6^{24} *al.*, לְרַע לְ Jer. 7^{6} *al.*, כְּנוֹחַ לְ Neh. 9^{28}, לְחֹם לְ Hag. 1^{6}); but as pointed (with the *art.*), it can hardly be anything but the subst. צַר, בַּצַּר לִי being regarded as a poetical variation of the more prosaic בְּצָרָתִי (cf. the late expressions Ps. 120^{1} בַּצָּרָתָה לִּי, Jon. 2^{3} מִצָּרָה לִי).—ומצאך] the pf. with ו consec., carrying on בצר לך (G-K. § 112. 3*c n*; Dr. § 118).—באחרית הימים ושבת] here the ו consec. introduces the pred., ושבת being the syntactical equivalent of תשוב: Gn. 3^{5} Ex. 16^{6} ערב וידעתם at even—*then* ye shall know, 1 K. 13^{31} במותי וקברתם אתי, &c. (G-K. § 112. 5*c*; Dr. § 123 *β*).

and feeble (cf. of the hands, Jer. 6^{24} *al.*), opp. to *hold fast* (Job 27^{6} Song 3^{4} *al.*): so 31$^{6.8}$ Jos. 1^{5} 1 Ch. 28^{20}.—*Nor forget the covenant which he sware, &c.*] see on v.^{13} and 1^{8}; and comp. Lev. 26^{41b-45} (in the peroration of the "Law of Holiness").

32–40. Israel has grounds for knowing that Jehovah is God alone, who will not permanently abandon His people (v.$^{32-36}$), and who has a claim upon Israel for its obedience (v.$^{37-40}$).—32. *For*] introducing the considerations, tending to show that Jehovah will not forget His covenant (v.^{31}): nothing so marvellous has ever happened at any time, or in any place, since man appeared upon earth, as the wonders which Israel has witnessed at Ḥoreb (v.^{33}) and in Egypt (v.^{34}).—**33.** *Did ever people hear the voice of God?*] rather *a god.* The point is not whether any other nation ever so heard the voice of (the true) God, but whether any other god had ever given such evidence of his existence as Jehovah had done.—*Out of the midst of the fire*] v.^{12}.—*And live*] in accordance with the thought, often expressed, that no man can "see God and live" (5$^{23(26)}$ Gn. 16^{13} 32^{31} Ex. 20^{19} 33^{20} Jud. 6$^{22f.}$ 13^{22}; cf. Ex. 3^{6} 19^{21}).—**34.** *Or hath a god attempted* (נִסָּה) *&c.?*] has a god ever even attempted, or ventured (28^{56}), to come and take to himself a nation out of the midst of another nation, as Jehovah has done in the case of Israel?—*Trials* (מַסֹּת)] or *provings* (on 6^{16}), *i.e.* testings of the character and disposition of Phara'oh, effected by the display of Jehovah's might (7^{19} 29^{2}).—*War*] Ex. 14$^{14.25}$.—*With signs and with portents*] Ex. 4$^{8.9.17.28.30}$ 10$^{1.2}$ (אֹתֹת); 4^{21} 7^{9} 11$^{9.10}$ (מֹפְתִים); both, as here, Ex. 7^{3} Dt. 6^{22} 7^{19} 26^{8} 29^{2} 34^{11} (all with allusion to the marvels wrought in Egypt), 13$^{2.3}$ (as well as in other books). מוֹפֵת is a *portent*, an occurrence regarded merely as something extraordinary: אוֹת is a *sign*, i.e. something, ordinary (Ex. 12^{13} 31^{13} Is. 20^{3} &c.) or extraordinary, as the case may be, regarded as significant of a truth beyond itself, or impressed with a Divine purpose.—*A mighty hand*] on 3^{24}.—*A stretched out arm*] 9^{29} (with "great power," as

32. למן] a syn. of מִן, used esp. in designations of the *terminus a quo*, whether of time or place: *e.g.* 9^{7} 2 S. 7$^{6.11}$, למקצה השמים just below, Jud. 20^{1}; Ex. 11^{7} 2 S. 6^{19} (*Lex. s.v.* מִן, sub fin.).—נהיה] the nif., as 1 K. 1^{27} 12^{24} Jud. 19^{30} (‖ נראתה) 20^{3} *al.*, in the sense of *come to pass, happen.*

Digitized by Google

2 K. 17^{36} [compiler] Jer. 27^{5} 32^{17}); Ex. 6^{6} (P or H). The combination with *mighty hand*, first in Dt. 4^{34} 5^{15} 7^{19} 11^{2} 26^{8}; and (derived hence) Jer. 32^{21} (cf. 21^{5}) 1 K. 8^{42} (= 2 Ch. 6^{32}) Ez. $20^{33.\,34}$ Ps. 136^{12}†.—*And with great terrors* (מוֹרָאִים)], *i.e.* awe-inspiring manifestations. So 26^{8} 34^{12}. 𝔊 renders ὁράματα (as though מַרְאִים), which is weaker, though the reading is defended by Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 339 f.—*Before thine eyes*] on 1^{30}.—**35.** *Thou* (emph.) *wast made to see, so as to know that Jehovah, he is God: there is none else beside him*] this was the ultimate aim of the wonders wrought in Egypt: cf. Ex. 10^{2}. The truth, that Jehovah is not only God, but *sole* God, is emphasized again, v.^{39}, cf. 7^{9} 10^{17}: see on 6^{4}.—**36.** Jehovah's manifestations had been made alike from heaven and upon earth, with the intention of impressing vividly upon Israel the truth and reality of His words. *Out of heaven* had Israel heard the thunderings of God (Ex. 19^{16}), *that he might discipline thee*, *i.e.* that the people might be brought to a temper of becoming reverence; *and upon earth* (Ex. 19^{18}) had they seen *his great fire, and heard his words out of the midst of the fire*, embodying (cf. v.^{10b}) the fear of Him in a concrete form.—*To discipline thee* (לְיַסְּרֶךָּ)] comp. 8^{5}, and the cognate subst. מוּסָר 11^{2}.

"Instruct" (RV.) is not an adequate rendering. יִסֵּר denotes not the instruction of the intellect (לִמֵּד, הוֹרִיעַ), but the discipline or education of the moral nature: the spectacle was one adapted to quell waywardness and pride, and to generate in Israel's heart a temper of submissiveness and reverence. יִסֵּר is the word used to denote the discipline with which a parent trains his child (8^{5} Pr. 19^{18} 29^{17}); it is used also of other corrective dealings, sometimes severe ones, whether on the part of God or man (*e.g.* 1 K. $12^{11.\,14}$ Lev. 26^{18} Jer. 10^{24} 30^{11} Ps. 6^{2} 39^{12}).

37–40. *And because he loved thy fathers, and chose, &c. . . .,* (^{39}) *Know this day, and call to mind, that, &c. . . .,* (^{40}) *And keep, &c.*] *because* is lit. *in place of*, i.e. *in return for* (the fact) *that* (תַּחַת כִּי; cf. 21^{14} 22^{29} 28^{47}), which shows (Dillm.) that the construction here given is the correct one, and that the apodosis cannot be (RV.) at *chose*.—*Loved thy fathers*] God's love of the patriarchs is emphasized again in 10^{15}: comp. His

35. יהוה הוא האלהים] v.^{39} 7^{9} 1 K. 8^{60} $18^{39.\,39}$: הוא as 3^{22}.—**37–39.** תחת כי . . . וירעת] the pf. with ו consec., as 2 K. 22^{17} Is. 60^{13}, and in response to יען Is. $3^{16f.}$ 37^{29}, עקב Nu. 14^{24} &c. (Dr. § 123 γ; G-K. § 112. 5*b*).

Digitized by Google

love of Israel, 7^{8} (where see note) ^{13} 23^{6}. Neither is taught elsewhere in the Pent. Jehovah's *regard* for the patriarchs is, of course, frequently exemplified in the narratives of Genesis (both JE and P); comp. Ex. $3^{6.13.15.16}$ ("the God *of your fathers*") 32^{13} 33^{1}: and it is also referred to often elsewhere in Dt., as the ground of His care for their descendants (on 1^{8}); but His *love* of them is mentioned only in the passages quoted. —*And chose his seed after him*] if the text be correct, the reference will be specially to Abraham. The parallel passage 10^{15} has, however, *their* and *them*, which here also would harmonize better with the context, and which is expressed by all the ancient versions.—*And brought thee out with his presence* (בְּפָנָיו)] cf. Ex. 33^{14} פָּנַי יֵלֵכוּ, Is. 63^{9} "and the angel of his presence (מלאך פניו)] saved them"; also, for the general sense of פָּנִים, 2 S. 17^{11} (of a human person).—*With his great power* (בכחו הגדל)] 9^{29} Neh. 1^{10}; Jer. 27^{5} 32^{17} (both of creation); Ex. 32^{11} (בכח גדול), 2 K. 17^{36}: cf. Nu. $14^{13.17}$.—**38.** *To dispossess* (להוריש) . . . *from before thee*] $9^{4.5}$ 11^{23} 18^{12} (cf. 7^{17} 9^{3}) Ex. 34^{24} (JE).—*Greater and mightier than thou*] cf. $7^{1\,end}$ 9^{1} 11^{23}.—*As at this day*] 2^{30}. The reference may be either to the territory East of Jordan, or (by an anachronism) to Palestine generally: the similar language of $7^{1\,end}$ 9^{1} 11^{23} favours the latter interpretation.—**39.** The thought of v.^{35} repeated.—*And call to mind*] *i.e.* consider, reflect; see below.—*He is God in heaven above, &c.*] Jos. 2^{11} (D^{2}) 1 K. 8^{23} (Deut.).—אין עוד] Is. $45^{5.6.14.18.21.22}$ 46^{9}. Comp. on 6^{4}.—**40.** *That it may be well for thee* (ייטב לך)] $5^{16.26\,(29)}$ $6^{3.18}$ $12^{25.28}$ 22^{7}; cf. $5^{30\,(33)}$ 19^{13} (וְטוֹב לְךָ). —*After thee*] cf. on 1^{8}.—*Prolong days* (תאריך ימים)] on v.^{26}.—*For ever*] lit. *all the days*, a Heb. expression for *continually*, esp. frequent in Dt. (5^{26} 6^{24} 11^{1} 14^{23} 18^{5} 19^{9} $28^{29.33}$ Jos. 4^{21} [D^{2}]); though found also elsewhere, as Gen. 43^{9} 44^{32} 1 S. $2^{32.35}$ 18^{29} Jer. 31^{36} 32^{39} 33^{18} 35^{19} *al.*

39. והשבת אל לבבך] lit. "bring back to thy heart," i.e. *recall to mind*, *consider*: so 30^{1} 1 K. 8^{47} Is. 44^{19} 46^{8} (על) Lam. 3^{21}. "Bethink themselves" (AV. 1 K. 8^{47}) is a good paraphrase.—**40.** אשר ייטב לך] אשר, as often (cf. on 3^{24} 11^{19}), a link relating two sentences to each other; here resolvable into *so that*: so v.^{10} 6^{3} (cf. the ‖ למען 5^{26} 6^{18}), $28^{27.51}$ Gn. 11^{7} *al.* (*Lex.* אשר **8 b.**).

Digitized by Google

IV. 41 43. *The Appointment by Moses of three Cities of Refuge in the trans-Jordanic Territory.*

41–43. Bezer, Ramoth, and Golan appointed as Cities of Refuge.—The Deuteronomic law respecting the Cities of Refuge is contained in $19^{1\text{-}13}$ (to the notes on which the reader is referred for fuller explanations); and all the characteristic expressions in v.$^{41\text{-}42}$ here agree with those found there.

The verses mark a pause in the narrative, and seem designed to separate the introductory discourse 1^6–4^{40} from c. 5 ff. (Di. Oe.). Their origin is uncertain. It is possible, no doubt, that they may have formed an original part of Dt. (Di.). In $19^{1\text{ff.}}$, however, the Cities of Refuge appear to be introduced for the first time, as a new institution: had the writer of $19^{1\text{-}13}$ already described the appointment of three cities for the same purpose, it is difficult not to think that he would have framed his law so as to contain some allusion to the fact. It seems more probable, therefore (esp. if 1^1–4^{40} be not by the same hand as c. 5–26. 28), that $4^{41\text{-}43}$ was added by a later Deut. writer (perhaps R^d), who desiderated an express notice in Dt. of the trans-Jordanic Cities of Refuge, and, in accordance with a tradition which referred their appointment to Moses, supplied the omission by the insertion of these verses (König, *Einl.* p. 213; Oettli, *ad loc.*: comp. Kuen. § 7. 17*d*; Wellh. *Comp.* 207; Westphal, ii. 83). The phraseology is throughout Deuteronomic (like that of the additions in Jos. $20^{3\text{-}6}$; *L.O.T.* p. 105), and has no affinity with that of P's law in Nu. $35^{6.\,9\text{-}34}$. According to P, also (Jos. 20^8, cf. Nu. $35^{10\text{-}14}$), the Cities of Refuge on the East of Jordan, as well as those on the West, were appointed, not by Moses, but by *Joshua.*

Separated (יבדיל)] so $19^{2.\,7}$. The word implies not so much physical separation, as separation for a particular purpose or object, 10^8 $29^{20\,(21)}$; cf. *JPh.* xi. p. 219.—*Beyond Jordan*] on 1^1. —**42.** *That the manslayer . . . in time past*] agreeing nearly

41. או יבדיל] Dr. § 27β; G-K. § 107. 1ª R.¹.—**42.** לָנֻם שמה רוצח . . . וְנָם . . . וחי] לָנֻם שָׁמָּה is corrected, as the sentence proceeds, by the more precise אל אחת מן הערים האל, and this necessitates the repetition of the idea of fleeing: לָנֻם is accordingly resumed by וְנָם—"That he might flee thither . . . , *and* (=*yea*) *that he might* flee . . . and live." The inf. לָנֻם, with a final conj., is continued by the pff. וְנָם . . . וָחָי:, with *waw* consec., as regularly (*e.g.* Gn. 18^{25}; Dr. § 118); for the resumptive וְנָם, cf. 18^6 ובא, 20^{11} והיה, 29^{23} ואמרו (Dr. § 118 *n.*). On וָחָי:, see G-K. § 104. 2*e*.—והוא לא שנא לו] lit. "*and he being a not-hater to him* aforetime": so $19^{4.\,6}$ Jos. 20^5; Nu. 35^{23} והוא לא אויב לו (Dr. § 135. 7 *Obs.*). The ptcp. with לא is unusual (*ib.* § 162 *n.*); and שׂנא is best construed as a subst.—הָאֵל] as 7^{22} 19^{11} (but not ^{8}) Gn. $19^{8.\,25}$ $26^{3.\,4}$ Lev. 18^{27} (against האלה some 80 times in the Pent., and אלה 180 times).

Digitized by Google

verbally with $19^{3b. 4b. 5b}$.—**43.** *Beẓer* (בצר) *in the table-land*] Beẓer is mentioned besides Jos. 20^{8} 21^{36} [see RV. *m.*] (= 1 Ch. $6^{63 (78)}$); also on the Moabite Stone, l. 27, as one of the cities which Mesha' rebuilt after his revolt. Its site is unknown; but being in the "wilderness" (2^{8b}), it was probably situated towards the eastern border of the Moabite table-land (3^{10}).—*Ramoth in Gile'ad*] Jos. 20^{8} $21^{38 (36)}$ (= 1 Ch. $6^{65 (80)}$), or *Ramoth of Gile'ad*, 1 K. 4^{13} $22^{3ff.}$ 2 K. 8^{28} $9^{1ff.}$, according to Eusebius (*Onom.*, ed. Lag. p. 287) 15 Roman miles W. of Philadelphia (Rabbath Bnê 'Ammon). It is generally identified with es-Salṭ (see Bäd. p. 287); but Dillmann (on Gn. 31^{54}), following Hitzig and Langer (*Ausland*, 1882, p. 181), prefers a site 6 miles to the North of es-Salṭ, at the ruins of el-Jal'ûd. —*Golan*] Jos. 20^{8} 21^{27} (= 1 Ch. $6^{56 (71)}$), named by Eusebius (*Onom.* p. 242) as a κώμη μεγίστη, but not at present known. Golan gave its name to the province Gaulanitis, often mentioned by Josephus (cf. Schürer, *N. Zg.*² i. 354). On the modern district Jôlān (or *Jaulān*), see Bäd. p. 285; and Schumacher, *Survey of the Jaulân*, 1888.

IV. 44–49. *Superscription to the Exposition of the Law, contained in* c. 5–26. 28.

IV. 44–49. This superscription first (v.$^{44f.}$) characterizes the substance of the following discourse; it then specifies the place (v.^{46a}), and (indirectly) the time (v.$^{46b-49}$), at which it was delivered.

More than one difficulty arises in connexion with it. Not only does it appear to be superfluous after 1^{1-5}, which is plainly intended to refer, not to c. 1–4 only, but to the Deut. discourses generally (v.⁵: "to expound this law"), but even supposing that a special superscription were deemed

---

and 1 Ch. 20^{8} (אֵל)†. The word is written similarly in Phœn. (*CIS.* I. i. 3^{22} אלנם הקדשים אל "these holy gods," 14^{5} 93^{3} [cited on v.^{16}]), though it was pronounced prob. as a dissyllable (Schröder, *Phön. Gr.* § 61). The kindred dialects have generally a dissyllabic form (cf. *DB.*² i. 774 *n.*; Wright, *Comp. Gramm. of Sem. Lang.* p. 108 f.), which is an indication that the pron. terminated originally in a vowel sound. The variation is thus not an "archaism," but is purely orthographical: no doubt האל should be vocalized הָאֵל (cf. Phœn. ו, *i.e.* וֹ), just as את, עת, when they occur for אתה, עתה, are vocalized אַתָּ, עַתָּ.

Digitized by Google

desirable for c. 5–26, the minute particulars contained in v.$^{46-49}$ seem to be unnecessary when the circumstances there noted have been already described in detail in c. 2–3; moreover, v.^{45} is itself tautologous by the side of v.^{44}. The circumstantiality of the heading appears, in particular, to point to its being the work of a writer who either (*a*) was not acquainted with 1^{1}–4^{40} or (*b*) disregarded it. By those (*a*) who hold the original Dt. to have been limited to c. 5–26. 28, 4$^{45-49}$—or (König, who thinks v.$^{47-49}$ added subsequently) 4$^{45-46}$—is accordingly considered to have been the superscription to that discourse, to which 1^{1}–4^{40} was prefixed afterwards as an introduction, whether by the original writer (Graf, *Gesch. Bücher*, pp. 6, 13; Kleinert, pp. 33, 168), or by a somewhat later hand (Wellh. *Comp.* p. 192; Kuenen, § 7, *n.* 12; Valeton, *Studiën*, vi. p. 225; Westphal, pp. 82, 87; König, *Einl.* p. 212 f.), v.^{44} being inserted at the same time as a connecting link. Dillmann (*b*) on the contrary, who observes that the verses include slight phraseological traits which are not those of D (see the notes), and that v.^{49} appears to be borrowed from 3^{17}, which forms (see note) part of an *insertion* in the original narrative of c. 3, considers the superscription not to be original, but to have been added here by the Redactor of Dt. on the basis of material derived from c. 1–3, for the purpose of marking the distinctive character of the discourse which follows (c. 5–26), and declaring that the "exposition" of "the law," promised in 1^{5}, now begins. Dillm.'s attempt, however, to show that v.^{45} is not tautologous with v.^{44} cannot be pronounced successful: the supposition that the "law" of v.^{44} refers to c. 5–11, and the "testimonies, statutes, and judgments" of v.^{45} to c. 12–26, implying a forced distinction between the two expressions, which is not sustained by usage (see v.^{8}).

44. *And this*] 𝕲𝖁𝕾 omit *and*.—*The law*] 1^{5}.—*Laid before* (שׂם לפני)] Ex. 19^{7} 21^{1}: elsewhere Dt. has נתן לפני (on v.^{8}).—*The children of Israel*] sufficiently common in most books of the OT., but contrary to the general usage of Dt., which, even in the narrative parts, prefers "all Israel" (on 1^{1}); for 1^{3} 32^{51} 34^{8} are derived from P, 31$^{19.22.23}$ from JE, 10^{6} from E: elsewhere in the book only 3^{18} 23^{18} ("sons" as distinguished from daughters), 24^{7}, the heading 4$^{44.45.46}$, and the subscription 28^{69} (29^{1}).—**45.** *Testimonies*] 6$^{17.20}$: cf. 1 K. 2^{3} 2 K. 17^{15} 23^{3} (all Deut.); and see below. The idea of a "testimony" (or "witness") is that of an *attestation*, or formal affirmation; hence, as referred to God, a solemn declaration of His will on

45. עֵדֹת] 6$^{17.20}$. Elsewhere (in this form) only Ps. 25^{10} 78^{56} 93^{5} 99^{7} 132^{12}, and 14 times in Ps. 119. When written *plene* (עדות), the word is usually pointed עֵדְוֹת (1 K. 2^{3} 2 K. 17^{15} 23^{3} Jer. 44^{23} 1 Ch. 29^{19} 2 Ch. 34^{31} Ne. 9^{34}, and 8 times in Ps. 119†), which would be the pl. cstr. of עֵדוּת (Stade, § 320^{b}). A comparison of the two groups of passages (*e.g.* of 1 K. 2^{3} with Dt. 6^{17}) makes it evident, however, that the words, though differently vocalized, do not differ in meaning.

Digitized by Google

points (especially) of moral or religious duty, or a protest against human propensity to deviate from it (cf. העיד ב *to testify* or *protest against* [not *unto*], 2 K. 17^{15} Jer. 11^{7} Ps. 50^{7} 81^{9} Neh. $9^{26.\,29.\,30}$). The word came thus to be used, primarily through the influence of Dt., and writers of the same school, as a general designation of moral and religious ordinances, conceived as a Divinely instituted standard of conduct. Elsewhere, particularly in P, the term (in the singular) is applied specially to the Decalogue (Ex. $25^{16.\,21}$ 31^{18} 34^{29}; comp. the expressions, "Ark, Tabernacle, of the testimony," 25^{22} 38^{21} *al.*), as a concise and forcible statement of God's will and human duty.—*The statutes and the judgments*] 4^{1}.—*When they came forth out of Egypt*] so v.[46]. The phrase, descriptive of a date at the very end of the 40 years' wanderings, could not have been written by a contemporary; it must spring from a time when the 40 years in the wilderness had dwindled to a point.—**46**^{a}. *Beyond Jordan*] 1^{1}.—*In the ravine, &c.*] 3^{29}.—*Siḥon . . . Ḥeshbon*] 1^{4} 3^{2}.—**46**^{b}**–49**. The writer takes occasion, from the mention of the "land of Siḥon," to introduce, in the manner of the Deut. writers (on 1^{4}), a notice of Siḥon's defeat, and of the territory taken from him and ʿOg. The verses, esp. v.[47-49], are connected loosely with v.[45-46], and may be an addition by a later hand (Kön. p. 212).—*Smote*] 2^{33}.—**47**. *And they took, &c.*]. 2^{34} 3^{8}.—*Beyond Jordan, toward the sun-rising*] v.[41] Jos. 1^{15} 12^{1b} (both D^{2}).—**48–49**. *From ʿAroʿer, &c.*] slightly abridged, and altered, from 2^{36a} $3^{8b.\,17}$. The only remarkable variation is the fresh name *Sion* (שִׂיאֹן) for Ḥermon, which is not found elsewhere. 𝔖 reads שְׂרִיֹן, as 3^{9}; but this is no doubt a correction of the Hebrew text: there is no apparent reason why the *Sidonian* name of Ḥermon should have been used here.

V.–XXVI. XXVIII. *The Exposition of the Law.*

This consists of two parts, clearly distinguished from each other, both by their contents, and by the opening words of 12^{1}. The *first* part (c. 5–11) consists of a hortatory introduction, inculcating the *general* theocratic principles by which

6

Digitized by Google

Israel, as a nation, is to be governed. The *second* part (c. 12–26. 28) includes the code of *special* laws, which it is the object of the legislator to "expound" (1^5), with reference, in particular, to the purposes which they subserve, and to the motives which should prompt their observance.

V.–XI. *Hortatory Introduction.*

C. 5–11 consists essentially of a development of the first Commandment of the Decalogue. With warm and persuasive eloquence, the legislator sets before Israel its primary duty of loyalty to Jehovah, urging upon it the motives to obedience by which it ought to be impelled, and warning it against the manifold temptations to neglectfulness by which it might be assailed. He begins by reminding Israel of the covenant concluded with it at Ḥoreb on the basis of the Decalogue, and of the promise which the nation had then given that it would obey whatever future commands Jehovah might lay upon it (c. 5). The Israelite's fundamental duty is to *love* Jehovah, to be devoted to Him with intense and undivided affection, not to forget Him in the enjoyment of material prosperity, or to forsake Him for false gods, but to serve Him loyally himself, and to teach his children to serve Him loyally afterwards (c. 6). Upon entering Canaan, no truce is to be made with the Canaanites, no intercourse with them is to be tolerated: Israel is holy to Jehovah; and motives of fear, not less than of gratitude, should prompt it to give effect to His will: in its crusade against heathenism, it may rest assured of His ever present aid and succour (c. 7). Let Israel recollect the lessons of the wilderness, and take to heart its dependence upon Jehovah, lest it be tempted, in the midst of the good things of Canaan, to forget the Giver, and perish like the nations whom God is casting out before it (c. 8). Let Israel, further, beware of self-righteousness; let it remember how from the beginning it has shown a wilful and rebellious nature, and how its present existence as a nation is due solely to Jehovah's forbearance (9^1–10^{11}). For these and other mercies, the only return which Jehovah demands is loving and ready obedience ($10^{12f.}$). And this obedience should be prompted by the thought of the favour

Digitized by Google

with which the Lord of heaven and earth had visited Israel (10^{14-22}), of the deeds wrought by Him on its behalf at the Exodus (11^{1-9}), and of its dependence upon Him for its future prosperity in Canaan (11^{10-25}). The Writer ends this part of his discourse by solemnly reminding Israel of the two alternatives, the blessing and the curse, now offered for its acceptance (11^{26-32}).

V. 1–18. The covenant concluded by Jehovah with Israel at Ḥoreb, on the basis of the Decalogue.—1. The aim of the discourse (c. 5–26. 28) here beginning, viz. that Israel may learn, and obey, Jehovah's commands.—*All Israel*] 1^{1}.—*Hear, O Israel*] 6^{4} 9^{1} 20^{3}: cf. 4^{1} 6^{3}†.—*This day*] 4^{40}.—*Observe to do*] on 4^{6}.—**2–18 (21).** The Writer begins by reminding Israel of the fundamental principles of the covenant, as embodied in the Decalogue (4^{13}).—**3.** *Not with our fathers*] this covenant was made not with our forefathers, the patriarchs ($4^{31.37}$ $7^{8.12}$ 8^{18}), but with *us* (4^{23}), who are here alive to-day (cf. 4^{4}): it is *we*, therefore, who are bound by the terms of it. The fact that the greater part of those who stood at Ḥoreb, 40 years before, had passed away, is disregarded: cf. 11^{2-7}, and on 1^{30}.—**4.** *Face to face spake Jehovah*] thus solemnly and impressively was the covenant inaugurated.—פנים בפנים] cf. פנים אל פנים 34^{10} Ex. 33^{11} (both of Moses), Gn. 32^{31} Jud. 6^{22}: עין בעין Nu. 14^{14} Is. 52^{8}.—*Out of the midst of the fire*] on 4^{12}.—**5.** *I standing between Jehovah and you, &c.*] the words, to *mount*, are parenthetical (see RV.), describing the part taken by Moses as mediator between God and the people—of course, as the terms used imply, at the time when the Decalogue was promulgated, not in the communication of commands received by him subsequently, 5^{20-28} $^{(23-31)}$ 4^{14}. The representation of Moses as mediator, for the purpose of "declaring" or "reporting" (see below) the words of the Decalogue, is apparently at variance with v.$^{4.19.21\,(22.24)}$ $4^{12.15.16}$ 10^{4}, in which Jehovah seems to be described as having spoken them audibly to the people. It appears, however,

V. 3. אנחנו] emphasizing the suff. in אתנו (G-K. § 135. 2c; 1 S. 19^{23} 25^{24}), and then further strengthened by אלה פה וג׳, in appos.—"but with us, *us*, these here to-day," &c.—**4.** פנים בפנים] "(with) face in face,"—an implicit accus. of closer definition (G-K. § 156. 2).—**5.** אנכי עמד] a circ. cl. (Dr. § 161).—להגיד] *to declare*. "Show" (AV. RV.) is used here in the old sense

Digitized by Google

that according to the conception of D, the people heard the "voice" of God, but not distinct words: the latter Moses declared (הִגִּיד) to them afterwards. And in fact this representation is not inconsistent with Ex. $19^{9.19}$—both verses belonging to E, and followed originally by 20^{1-17} (the intermediate verses 19^{20-25} forming part of the parallel narrative of J): according to these passages God speaks *with* Moses, and the people overhear the thunder of His voice, but they do not necessarily hear distinctly the actual words spoken.— *The word of Jehovah*] 𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙, "words": so Kuen. *Th. T.* 1881, p. 180.

6–18 (21). The Decalogue, repeated from Ex. 20^{1-17}, with verbal differences, sometimes slight, in other cases more considerable. The longer variations are mostly in agreement with the style of Dt., and the Writer's hand is recognizable in them. On the Decalogue in general, see the notes on Ex. 20^{1-17}: only the variations which the text of Dt. exhibits will be noticed here.—**8.** *A graven image*, (even) *any form*, *&c.*] Ex. 20^{4} "a graven image, *or* (וְ) any form, &c." Comp. $4^{16.23.25}$; and see below.—**9.** ועל שלשים] Ex. על שלשים.—**12.** *Observe*

of the word, to *report* or *tell*: see AV. Gn. 46^{31} Ex. 13^{8} 1 S. 9^{6} &c. (RV. *tell*), RV. Dt. $17^{9.10.11}$ 32^{7} 1 S. 3^{15} *al.*—**8.** פסל כל תמונה אשר וג׳] the construction is difficult, and uncertain. In view of Ex. 20^{4} (as it stands), and of the fondness of D for apposition (on 18^{1}), the rend. adopted above is at least the most obvious (so $4^{16.23.25}$). It is true, תמונה denotes nothing material; and hence it might be objected that a תמונה could not be "made": but the direct obj. of תעשה is פסל; and תמונה may signify not only "that in an object which may be imitated," but also "that wherein an object made resembles its model": in making a פסל, therefore, a תמונה is at the same time produced. This "form" is then, by an inexactness of language, identified with the corresponding "form" ("that is in heaven," &c.) upon which it was modelled (RV. eases the sentence by inserting "the likeness of"). Ewald (*Hist.* ii. 160), W. A. Wright, *JPh.* iv. 156, Di., divide the verses Dt. 5^{8-9} (=Ex. 20^{4-5}) differently, treating כל ת׳ as a *casus pendens*, and construing: "Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image: (and) every form that is in heaven above, &c., thou shalt not bow down to them, or worship them." Others assimilate the text of Ex. to that of Dt., omitting ו in וכל תמונה, and rendering, "a graven image *of* any form," &c. (so also $4^{16.23.25}$); but the combination פסל תמונה seems a doubtful one, and it is peculiarly hard when followed, as in 4^{16}, by another genitive.—**9.** תָעָבְדֵם] so Ex. 20^{5} 23^{24}; Dt. 13^{3} נָעָבְדֵם. The impf. Qal is ordinarily יַעֲבֹר :יַעַבְדֻנִי (Ex. 4^{23} &c.); and it is a question how these four anomalous forms are to be explained. Ols. § 261, Stade, §§ 549^{g}, 588^{e},

Digitized by Google

(שָׁמוֹר)] 16[1]. In Ex. 20[9] "remember."—*As Jehovah thy God commanded thee*] so v.[16] 20[17]; cf. 6[25] 24[8], and the frequent "As Jehovah spake unto thee" (on 1[21]). A comment on the words spoken, which is of course not strictly appropriate in what purports to be a *report* of them.—**14.** *And thy man-servant*] Ex. 20[10] without "and."—*And thine ox, and thine ass, and all thy cattle*] Ex. 20[10] has for these words simply "and thy cattle."—*That thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou*] this clause is not found in Ex. 20[10], though it expresses the thought of Ex. 23[12b] (in the "Book of the Covenant"). The philanthropic motive assigned for the observance of the sabbath is in accordance with the spirit which prevails elsewhere in Dt. (*e.g.* 12[12. 18] 14[26b] 16[11]).—**15.** *And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence, &c.*] this verse is not in Ex., the corresponding place (Ex. 20[11]) being occupied by the words, "For in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day: therefore Jehovah blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." The recollection of the servitude in Egypt is made a motive for kindliness towards others placed in a similar position in 15[15] 16[12] 24[18. 22] (each time in almost the same words),—in 15[15] 24[18] coupled, as here, with the injunction to remember gratefully the deliverance thence. It might accordingly seem (cf. v.[14b]) as if the observance of the sabbath were inculcated upon a similar ground; but the words which follow, "Therefore Jehovah thy God commanded thee to hold the sabbath day," show that the sabbath is viewed here as a periodical memorial of Israel's deliverance from Egypt,

Kōn. i. p. 259 f., treat them as Hofʿal forms, as though the meaning were, "Thou shalt not be made to serve them" (pass. of הַעֲבִיר *to make to serve*, Jer. 17[4]); Ew. §§ 66[c], 89[b], 251[d] regards them as irregular forms of Qal, but fails to explain satisfactorily the two *o* sounds. If the forms are Hof., the idea of *compulsory* idolatry, whether resulting (Ges.) from external pressure, or (König) from an irresistible inward impulse, is artificial, and not favoured by the context; if they are Qal, the *o* sounds are unaccounted for. Under the circumstances, the most probable view is that of G-K. (§ 60 R. 1), that the punctuators intended the forms to be understood as Hof., but that the original pronunciation was (as regularly elsewhere, *e.g.* Jer. 16[11]) תַּעַבְדֵם, נַעַבְדֵם.—**12.** שָׁמוֹר] on 1[16].

Digitized by Google

and of its relation to Jehovah, which was sealed thereby (4[20. 34] 7[6-8] &c.).—*To hold* (עשׂות)] rather a technical expression, used of the sabbath only once besides, in Ex. 31[16] (P). Comp. on 16[1]. —**16.** Honour thy father and thy mother, *as Jehovah thy God commanded thee*; that thy days may be long, *and that it may be well for thee*, upon the land which Jehovah thy God is giving thee] the two italicized clauses are not in Ex. 20[12]. With the first clause, comp. v.[12]; the second clause as v.[26 (29)] 6[18] 12[25. 28] 22[7].—**17 (AV. 17–20).** In Ex. 20[13-16] the 6th to the 9th Commandments form each an independent sentence: in Dt. they are connected by the conjunction (וְלֹא), producing a more flowing period. Similarly in v.[18 (21)].—**17 (20).** *And thou shalt not answer against* (19[16]) *thy neighbour, as a vain witness*] עֵד שָׁוְא *i.e.* a hollow, insincere witness: in Ex. 20[16] עֵד שֶׁקֶר *i.e.* definitely a *false witness*, the more common expression (Dt. 19[18] Ps. 27[12] Pr. 6[19] 14[5] 25[18]).—**18 (21).** *And* thou shalt not desire thy neighbour's wife, *and* thou shalt not *long for* thy thy neighbour's house, *his field*, or his man-servant, or his maid-servant, his ox, &c.] in Ex. 20[17] "Thou shalt not desire thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not desire thy neighbour's wife, or his man-servant, or his maid-servant, *or* his ox," &c. In Ex. "house" appears to be used in a comprehensive sense, embracing not only the actual dwelling, but also wife, servant, ox, ass, and other possessions constituting a domestic establishment (cf. Gn. 15[2] Job 8[15]), examples of which are afterwards specified separately; in Dt. the wife, as the dearest and closest of a man's possessions, is named separately in the first place, and "house" is limited to ordinary domestic property, land, servant, ox, and ass being the illustrations chosen. For "desire" (חָמַד) in the second place, Dt. has הִתְאַוָּה, apparently merely as a rhetorical variation; for הִתְאַוָּה, though a somewhat stronger term than חמד, and rarer, especially in prose, does not express a substantially different idea. חמד, expressing in itself a perfectly lawful affection (Is. 53[2] Ps. 68[17 (16)]), acquires from the context the sense of sinful coveting (cf. Mic. 2[2] Ex. 34[24]): for התאוה, comp. 2 S. 23[15] (RV. "longed") Pr. 13[4] 23[3] Ps. 45[12 (11)].

19–30 (22–33). Request of the people that Jehovah's future

Digitized by Google

commands might be conveyed to them by Moses.—19 (22). [והערפל] העגן 4^{11}.—*And he added no more* (ולא יסף)] as we should say, "and he then stopped": cf. Nu. 11^{25}.—*And he wrote them, &c.*] the statement anticipates what, according to 9^{9-11} Ex. 32^{18b}, only took place subsequently: it is introduced here for the purpose of completing the narrative respecting the Decalogue. —**20–24 (23–27).** The people request (comp. Ex. 20^{18-21}) that in future Moses may speak with them as God's representative. —**20 (23).** ותקרבון אלי] 1^{22}.—*The heads of your tribes*] 1^{15} (cf. on 29^{9}).—*Elders*] cf. 27^{1} 29^{9} $31^{9.28}$.—**21 (24).** *His greatness*] 3^{24}.—*We have heard his voice, &c.*] $4^{12.33}$.—*That God doth speak with man, and he liveth*] contrary to general experience: comp. 4^{33}, with note.—**22–24 (25–27).** Nevertheless the spectacle is such a terrible one, and it can so little be expected that the verdict of experience will again be reversed, that they dread to witness it any further.—**23 (26).**—*All flesh*] the expression sometimes embraces all living beings (as Gn. $6^{17.19}$ Nu. 18^{15}): more commonly it denotes mankind alone (Gn. $6^{12.13}$ Nu. $16^{22} = 27^{16}$ Is. $40^{5.6}$ *al.*): cf. *Lex.* בָּשָׂר **6.** The expression characterizes living creatures, in tacit contrast to God, as frail, unsubstantial, and dependent (Is. 31^{3} Jer. 17^{5} Job 10^{4}).—*That hath heard, &c. and lived*] cf. 4^{33}.—*The living God* (אלהים חיים)] this "significant and moving name" (Sanday, *Bampt. Lect.* 1893, p. 124, cf. 153) recurs 1 S. $17^{26.36}$ Jer. 10^{10} 23^{36}†; (א׳ חַי) 2 K. $19^{4.16}$ (= Is. $37^{4.17}$)†; (אֵל חַי) Jos. 3^{10} Hos. 2^{1} (1^{10}) Ps. 42^{3} 84^{3}†; Dan. $6^{21.27}$†. —**24 (27).** *And thou* (emph.) *shalt speak unto us, &c.; and we will hear, and do*] comp. Ex. 20^{19} דַּבֵּר אַתָּה עִמָּנוּ וְנִשְׁמָעָה.—**25 f. (28 f.).** Jehovah declares Himself graciously pleased to accede to the entreaty of the people; and gives warm expression to the hope that their present obedient frame of mind may be maintained perpetually.—*And Jehovah heard the voice of your words*]

19. קול גדול] "(with) a loud voice" (2 S. 19^{5} 1 K. 8^{55}),—the accus., as v.^{4}.—**20.** והחר בֹּער באש]="*while* the mount burned with fire,"—a circ. clause (G-K. § 141. 2; Dr. § 159).—**21.** ידבר . . . וחי׃] Dr. §§ 38 *a*; 113. 4 *a*; G-K. § 112. 3 *b α*.—**22.** אם יספים אנחנו] Dr. § 135. 4.—ומתנו] introducing the apod. (*ib.* § 137 *a*; G-K. § 112. 5^{a}).—**24.** קְרַב אַתָּה] "draw *thou* near" (emph.): cf. Ex. 20^{19} (above), Jud. 8^{21} קוּם אַתָּה, 1 S. 17^{56} שְׁאַל אַתָּה, 20^{8} 22^{18} סֹב אַתָּה, Is. 43^{26} סַפֵּר אַתָּה.—וְאַתְּ] so (in the *masc.*) Nu. 11^{15} Ez. 28^{14}† (G-K. § 32 R.^{4}), as in the Aram. of 𝕿. No doubt אַתָּ should be read (as Ps. 6^{4} 1 S. 24^{19} *al.*: *v. Lex.* p. 61).

Digitized by Google

so 1^{34}. The words addressed to Moses, as in 1^{34} those spoken in the privacy of Israel's tents, were (so to speak) overheard by Jehovah.—*They have well said, &c.*] so 18^{17}.—**26 (29)**. *O that this their heart were theirs continually, to fear me, &c.*] O that their present temper might continue, and not pass away, when the impressions to which it is due have been obliterated and forgotten.—*That it may be well for them*] 4^{40} 5^{16}, cf. v.$^{30\,(33)}$. **27 f. (30 f.)**. Moses is to receive from God, and afterwards to communicate to Israel, the commandments to be observed by them, when they are settled in Canaan.—**28 (31)**. *All the commandment, &c.*] "the (*or* this) commandment" recurs 6^{1} 7^{11} 30^{11}; with "all," 6^{25} 8^{1} $11^{8.\,22}$ 15^{5} 19^{9} 27^{1} (of a special injunction, 31^{5}). As 11^{22} 19^{9} show, it denotes the Deut. legislation generally (esp. on its moral and religious side), viewed as the expression of a single principle, the fundamental duty of 6^{5}. Westphal (pp. 36, 111) supposes that here it refers particularly to the development of 6^{5} contained in c. 6–11 (cf. 6^{1} 7^{11}), while the "statutes and judgments" (on 4^{1}) embrace the laws comprehended in c. 12–26 (cf. 12^{1} 26^{16}).—*Which thou shalt teach them, that they may do them, &c.*] cf. $4^{1.\,5.\,14}$ (see note), 6^{1} 12^{1}.—*Which I am giving them to possess it*] cf. 12^{1} (נָתַן) 15^{4} $19^{2.\,14}$ 21^{1} 25^{19}.—The verse, as a whole, appears to be parallel with Ex. 24^{12} E (where "which I have written," it is probable, originally followed "tables of stone"; see Kuenen, *Th. T.* 1881, p. 194 f.; Budde, *ZATW.* 1891, p. 225; Bacon, *JBLit.* 1893, pp. 31, 33).—**29 f. (32 f.)**. Upon Jehovah's gracious response Moses founds an exhortation to obedience.—**29 (32)**. *Observe, then, to do*] on 4^{6}.—*Hath commanded*] the past tense as v.$^{30\,(33)}$ 6^{17}. According to these passages (cf. 4^{5}) the laws received by Moses on Ḥoreb had already been made known to the people; the aim of the discourses in Dt. is to recapitulate and reinforce them, immediately before the Israelites' entrance into the land in which they are designed to come into operation (v.$^{28\,(31)}$ $4^{5.\,14}$ 6^{1} 12^{1}).—*Ye shall not turn aside, &c.*] so (metaph.) $17^{11.\,20}$ 28^{14} Jos. 1^{7} 23^{6} (both D^{2}) 2 K. 22^{2} (Deut.) = 2 Ch. 34^{2};

26. מי יתן והיה] Dr. § 115 (*s.v.* מִי).—לבבם זה] זה (not הזה) in accordance with rule, after a noun defined by a *suffix* (*Lex. s.v.* זה **2 b**; Dr. § 209 *Obs.*): 21^{20} Jud. 6^{14} *al.* So with אלה, 11^{18} Ex. 10^{1} 11^{8} &c.—**27.** שובו לכם] on 1^{7}.

Digitized by Google

(lit.) Dt. 2^{27} (see note) 1 S. 6^{12}†.—**30 (33).** *The way which Jehovah your God hath commanded you*] 9^{12} (from Ex. 32^{8}) ^{16} 11^{28} $13^{6\,(5)}$ 31^{29}.—*Live*] 4^{1}.—*Prolong days, &c.*] $4^{26.\,40}$.

VI. 1–3. The benefits which Israel may hope to receive, if it is obedient to the commandments now about to be laid before it.—1. *And this is the commandment, &c.*] promised in $5^{28\,(31)}$: cf. 7^{11}.—*To teach you, &c.*] $4^{1.\,14}$ $5^{28\,(31)}$: cf. on $5^{29\,(32)}$.—**2.** *That thou mightest fear, &c.*] cf. 4^{10} $5^{26\,(29)}$. To implant in Israel the spirit of true religion and dutiful obedience to Jehovah's will, is the aim and scope of Moses' instruction.—*Which I am commanding thee*] 4^{2}.—*Thou, and thy son, &c.*] the Writer's thought passes from the nation to the individual Israelite: cf. on 1^{21}.—*All the days of thy life*] 4^{9} 16^{3}, cf. 17^{19}.—*Be prolonged*] cf. on 4^{26}.—**3.** *That it may be well for thee*] on 4^{40}.—*As Jehovah spake (promised) unto thee*] Gn. 15^{5} 22^{17} 26^{4} 28^{14} Ex. 32^{13} (all JE); cf. on 1^{11}.—*A land flowing with milk and honey*] Ex. $3^{8.\,17}$ 13^{5} 33^{3} Nu. 13^{27} 14^{8} $16^{13.\,14}$ (all JE), Lev. 20^{24} (H), Dt. 11^{9} $26^{9.\,15}$ 27^{3} 31^{20} Jos. 5^{6} (D^{2}), Jer. 11^{5} 32^{22} Ez. $20^{6.\,15}$†. The words, however, stand here out of construction, the rendering "*in* a land" being illegitimate. It seems either that the clause has been misplaced, perhaps (Dillm.) from the end of v.[1], or that words have dropped out after "unto thee," such as "in the land which Jehovah thy God is giving thee" (cf. 27^{3}).

4–5. The fundamental truth of Israel's religion, the uniqueness and unity of Jehovah; and the fundamental duty founded upon it, viz. the devotion to Him of the Israelite's entire being.—**4.** *Hear, O Israel*] 5^{1}.—*Jehovah our God is one Jehovah*] the question here is in what sense the pred. "one" is to be under-

30. ונטוב לכם] טוב is here not the adj., but the 3 pers. perf. of the verb *to be well*, with ו consec. (constr. as 4^{1}). So 19^{13} 1 S. $16^{16.\,23}$: cf. Nu. 11^{18}. For the impf., יִיטַב (from [יָטַב], cf. הֵיטִיב) is used: 4^{40} 5^{16} &c.—**VI. 3.** אשר] 4^{40}.—**4.** יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד] the words have been variously rendered. (*a*) "J. our God, (even) J., is one" (Ew. *Bibl. Theol.* ii. 1. 243; Oehler, *OT. Theol.* § 43; RV. 1st *m.*); (*b*) "J. is our God, J. is one" (RV. 2nd *m.*); (*c*) "J. is our God, J. alone" (Ibn 'Ezra, RV. 3rd *m.*); (*d*) "J. our God is one J." (Schultz, Keil, Baudissin, *Sem. Rel.-Gesch.* i. 167, Di. Oe. AV. RV., and most). In meaning, *a* and *b* do not differ materially from *d*; but as against *a*, no sufficient reason appears for the resumption of the subject by the second "Jehovah"; *b* is less forcible rhetorically than *d*; *c* assigns a dub. sense to אחד ("alone" is לבדו 2 K. 19^{15} Ps. 86^{10}); *d* thus

Digitized by Google

stood. Does it express the *unity* of Jehovah, declaring that He is in His essence indivisible, cannot—like Baʿal and ʿAshtōreth, for instance, who are often spoken of in the plural number (*e.g.* 1 S. 7^4: comp. on 4^3)—assume different phases or attributes, as presiding over different localities, or different departments of nature, and cannot further be united syncretistically (as was done sometimes by the less spiritual Israelites) with heathen deities; but is only known under the one character by which He has revealed Himself to Israel (Ewald, F. W. Schultz)? Or does it denote the ***uniqueness*** of Jehovah (see for this sense of "one" Zech. 14^9 Song 6^9 Job 33^{23}), representing Him as God in a unique sense, as the God with whom no other "Elohim" can be compared, as the only Deity to whom the true attributes of the Godhead really belong (Keil, Oehler, Baudissin, E. König, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 38, Oettli)? The second interpretation gives the higher and fuller meaning to the term, and forms also a more adequate basis for the practical duty inculcated in v.[5] (for a God, who was "one," but not at the same time "unique," might not necessarily be a worthy object of human love). The first interpretation is not however excluded by it: for the unity of Jehovah is almost a necessary corollary of His uniqueness. The verse is thus a great declaration of Monotheism (in the sense both that there is only one God, and also that the God who exists is truly one). Comp. Zech. 14^9.

The truth is one which in its full significance was only gradually brought home to the Israelites; and it can hardly be said to be *explicitly* enunciated much before the age of Dt. and Jer. It is often indeed implied that Jehovah is *superior* to "other gods," or that "other gods" cannot be compared to Him (*e.g.* Ex. 15^{11} Ps. $18^{32\,(31)}$ Dt. 3^{24}); and expressions

remains the most prob. rend.—In the Mas. text of this verse, the first and last words (אחד . . . שמע) each end with a *litera majuscula*. Various explanations of the peculiarity have been proposed (see Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, ch. xiv.; or C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* (פרקי אבות), p. 131). Of course it did not originate with the author of Dt.; the intention of the scribes who introduced it may have been to mark the importance of the verse, as embodying the fundamental article of the Jewish faith, or to warn the scribe (or reader) that the words must be distinctly written (or pronounced). It is said in the Talmud (*Berachoth* 15^b) that "Gehenna is cooled for whoever pronounces the *Shĕma*ʿ distinctly" (כל קורא ק״ש ומדקדק באותיותיה מצננין לו גיהנם).

Digitized by Google

respecting His supremacy over nature or the heathen world, and His relation to "other gods," are used (as by Amos), which logically leave no room for heathen gods beside Him: still, the real existence of "other gods" does not seem to be actually denied; and it is only gradually seen distinctly, and taught explicitly, not only that Jehovah is unique *among* "other gods," but that "other gods" have no real existence whatever beside Him (Dt. $4^{35.39}$ 32^{39} (the Song), Is. 44^{6} $45^{5.6.14.18.21}$ 46^{9}: cf. "*the* God" (האלהים) Dt. $4^{35.39}$ 7^{9} 2 S. 7^{28} 1 K. 8^{60} *al.*). The truth is emphasized and illustrated with the greatest eloquence and power by II Isaiah (esp. c. 40–48). See further on this subject, Baudissin, *Rel.-Gesch.* 150–177; Kuenen, *Theol. Rev.* 1874, p. 329 ff.; *Hibbert Lectures*, 1882, pp. 119, 317 ff.; *Onderzoek*, § 71. 6; König, *Hauptprobleme*, 38 ff.; Schultz, *AT. Theol.*[4] 159 ff., 205–207, 275–277 (E.T. i. 175–184, 226–229, 304); Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1892, pp. 134–137, 214–216, 268 ff.; Smend, *AT. Theol.* 1893, pp. 356–360.

5. *And thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy force*] the primary duty of the Israelite, not to serve different gods indiscriminately, but to devote himself, with undivided allegiance, and with the pure and intense affection denoted by the term "love," to the service of the one Jehovah. The *love* of God, while alluded to as characterizing Jehovah's true worshippers in the Decalogue (Ex. 20^{6} = Dt. 5^{10}, cf. 7^{9}), is set forth in Dt. with peculiar emphasis as the fundamental motive of human action (10^{12} $11^{1.13.22}$ $13^{4(3)}$ 19^{9} $30^{6.16.20}$; so Jos. 22^{5} 23^{11} (both D^{2}): not elsewhere in the Hex.): comp. in other books Jud. 5^{31} 1 K. 3^{3} Neh. 1^{5} Dan. 9^{4} (both from Dt. 7^{9}), Ps. 31^{24} 97^{10} 145^{20}. "It is a duty which follows naturally as the grateful response to Jehovah for the many undeserved mercies received at His hands (v.[12] $10^{12ff.}$); it involves the fear and the service of God (v.[13] 10^{12} 11^{13}); it impels those who are filled with it to the conscientious observance of *all* God's commands ($11^{1.22}$ 19^{9} 30^{16}): it thus appears as the most inward and the most comprehensive of all religious duties, and as the chief commandment of all (Mk. $12^{29f.}$)" (Dillm.).—*With all thy heart, and with all thy soul*] a specially Deuteronomic expression, implying the devotion of the *whole* being to God (see on 4^{29}). It occurs besides 4^{29} 10^{12} 11^{13} 13^{4} 26^{16} $30^{2.6.10}$; Jos. 22^{5} 23^{14} (both D^{2}); 1 K. 2^{4} 8^{48} (= 2 Ch. 6^{38}) 2 K. 23^{3} (= 2 Ch. 34^{31}) [25] (all Deut.); 2 Ch. 15^{12}: Jer. uses it once, of God, 32^{41}†. It is strengthened here by the addition of *and with all thy force*

Digitized by Google

(ובכל מאדך); hence 2 K. 23^{25} (of Josiah)†,—the only passages in which מְאֹד occurs in this sense (elsewhere always in adv. phrases, *with force = greatly*).—The passage, Dt. 6^{4-5}, is a great one; and it was a true instinct which led the Jews of a later time to select it for recitation twice daily by every Israelite (the *Shĕma'*). It is further significant that our Lord, when questioned as to the "first commandment of all" (Mt. $22^{37f.}$; Mk. $12^{29f.}$), and as to the primary condition for the inheritance of eternal life (Lk. $10^{27f.}$), should have referred both His questioners to the same text, with which daily use must have already made them familiar.

6–9. The words embodying this truth, and this duty, are to be ever in the Israelite's memory, and to be visibly inscribed before his eyes.—6. *These words*] *i.e.* v.$^{4-5}$, regarded as the quintessence of the entire teaching of the book.—*Shall be upon thy heart*] as it were, imprinted there (Jer. 31^{33}): cf. 11^{18a} ("And ye shall lay these my words *upon* your heart and *upon* your soul"), where the reference seems to be in particular to the truths expressed in 10^{12}–11^{17} (see esp. 11^{13}, which is parallel to 6^5 here, as 11^{18b} is to 6^8 and $11^{19f.}$ to $6^{7.9}$).—**7.** *And thou shalt impress them upon thy children*] שִׁנֵּן (only here) is properly, as it seems, *to prick in*, *inculcate*, *impress*. Comp. 11^{19} (teach); also 4^{9b} 6^{20-25}.—*And shalt talk of them when thou sittest, &c.*] in order that they may not be forgotten, they are to be a subject of conversation at all times (cf. 11^{19}).—**8.** *And thou shalt bind them for a sign* (לאות) *upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontlets* (לטוטפות) *between thine eyes*] so 11^{18}; see Ex. 13^9, and esp. 13^{16}, where the dedication of the first-born is to be "for a sign upon thine hand, and for frontlets between thine eyes," *i.e.* it is to serve as an ever-present memorial to the Israelite of his relationship to Jehovah and of the debt of gratitude which he owes Him. In Ex., the reference being to sacred

7. ודברת בם] on 3^{25}.—**8.** טוטפות] 11^{18} Ex. 13^{16}†. The form is generally supposed to be abbreviated for טפטפות (cf. Ew. § 158^c; Stade, § 116. 3). The etym. is uncertain. The Arab. *ṭāfa* is *to walk round about*, *make a circuit*; so perhaps טוטפות may have denoted properly *bands* going round the head, a *circle*, or *head-tire*. In 2 S. 1^{10} 𝔗 טוטפתא denotes a *bracelet* (= Heb. אצעדה); Ez. $24^{17.23}$ 𝔗 it has its techn. sense of *phylactery* (פאר being interpreted in that sense); so Est. 8^{15} 𝔗.

Digitized by Google

observances, the expressions are evidently meant figuratively (cf. Pr. 1^9 3^3 6^{21} 7^3): here, where the reference is to *words* only (v.$^{4-5}$), though the parallelism of Ex. $13^{9.16}$ would favour the same interpretation, it seems on the whole to be more probable that the injunction is intended to be carried out literally, and that some material, visible expression of the Israelite's creed is referred to; comp. v.^{9}, the terms of which support somewhat strongly the literal interpretation of v.^{8}.—*Between thine eyes*] *i.e.* on thy forehead: cf. 14^1.—**9.** *And thou shalt write them upon the door-posts of thy house, and on thy gates*] so 11^{20}. Probably an Egyptian custom, accommodated to the religious creed of the Hebrews.

"The ancient Egyptians sometimes wrote a lucky sentence over the entrance of the house, for a favourable omen, as 'the good abode,' the *múnzel mobárak* of the modern Arabs, or something similar; and the lintels and imposts of the doors, in the royal mansions, were frequently covered with hieroglyphics, containing the ovals and titles of the monarch." . . . We find "even the store-rooms, vineyards, and gardens, placed under the protection of a tutelary deity" (Wilkinson-Birch, *Anc. Egyptians*,[2] 1878, i. p. 361 f.). Similarly it is a common practice to the present day, in Moḥammedan countries, to inscribe verses from the Qor'ān, or pious invocations, upon (or over) the door (Lane, *Mod. Egypt.*[5] i. pp. 7 f., 319 f.).

The later Jews carried out the injunction in v.^{8} by inscribing Ex. $13^{1-10.11-16}$ and Dt. 6^{4-9} 11^{13-21} on small scrolls of parchment, which were then enclosed in cases, with leathern thongs attached, and bound on the forehead and left arm, at the time when the *Shᵉma'* was recited. These are the φυλακτήρια of the NT., called תְּפִלִּין by the Jews: cf. Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, i. 76. The antiquity of this custom is attested by the references to it in the Mishnah (*e.g. Berachoth* i.; *Pesaḥim* iv. 8; *Ta'anith* iv. 3: Schürer, *NZg.*[2] ii. p. 383): it can hardly be doubted also that it is alluded to by Josephus, *Ant.* iv. 8. 13 (quoted *ib.*). Its observance is still regarded as obligatory by all orthodox Jews. V.^{9} gave rise to the institution of the *Mezuzah* (*Berachoth* iii. 3; *Megillah* i. 8, &c.; Jos. *Ant.* iv. 8. 13; Buxtorf, *Synag. Jud.*[3] p. 581 ff.; Edersheim, *l.c.* p. 76). "Mezuzah" properly signifies a *door-post*; but among the Jews it is the name given to the small metal cylinder enclosing a square piece of parchment, inscribed with Dt. 6^{4-9} and 11^{13-21}, which is affixed to the upper part of the right hand door-post in every Jewish house, and regarded as an amulet; the pious Jew, as he passes it, touches it, or kisses his finger, reciting at the same time Ps. 121^8 (Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s.v. MEZUZA. See further Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, s.v. PHYLACTERIES).

10–15. Let Israel beware lest, in the enjoyment of material blessings, provided without exertion on its part, it forget Jehovah, its Deliverer, and desert Him for other gods.—The

Digitized by Google

same thought is drawn out more fully in 8^{7-18}: cf. 32^{13-15} Hos. 13^{6}.—**10.** *Which he sware, &c.*] 1^{8}.—**11.** *Cisterns hewn out*] viz. for the storage of water during the hot season, such as are still common in Palestine: cf. Neh. 9^{25} (a quotation), 2 Ch. 26^{10} Is. 36^{16}, and Mesha'’s inscription, l. 24–25, "And there was no cistern in Ḳerēḥō: and I said to all the people, Make you each a cistern (בר) in his own house."—*Eat and be full*] $8^{10.12}$ 11^{15} 14^{29} 26^{12} 31^{20} Joel 2^{26} Ps. 22^{27} 78^{29} Ru. 2^{14} 2 Ch. 31^{10} Neh. 9^{25},—sometimes referred to purely as a blessing, sometimes as tending to elation of heart, and consequently a source of spiritual danger (6^{11} 8^{12} 11^{15} 31^{20} Neh. 9^{25}).—**12.** *Beware* (השמר־לך)] 4^{9}.—*The house of bondage* (בית עבדים)] lit. *house of slaves*, *i.e.* place where slaves were kept in confinement, like the Latin *ergastulum*. So 7^{8} 8^{14} $13^{6.11}$ Jos. 24^{17} (D^{2}) Jud. 6^{8} (Deut.) Mic. 6^{4} Jer. 34^{13}. The expression occurs first in Ex. $13^{3.14}$ (JE), 20^{2} (= Dt. 5^{6})†. It is always used with reference to Egypt.—**13–15.** Israel's duty is to cleave steadfastly to Jehovah; and not to forsake Him for other gods, lest His jealousy be roused, and He be moved to destroy His people.—**13.** *Jehovah thy God shalt thou fear*] the fundamental element of the religious temper and the basis of other religious emotions (*e.g.* of devotion and love, 10^{12}), often inculcated in Dt. (4^{10} $5^{26(29)}$ $6^{2.24}$ 8^{6} $10^{12.20}$ 13^{5} 14^{23} 17^{19} 28^{58} $31^{12.13}$). "The fear of Jehovah" and "one that feareth Jehovah" or "God" (יִרְאַת יהוה; יְרֵא יהוה (אלהים): Job 1^{1} 28^{28} Ex. 18^{21} &c.) are thus the Hebrew equivalents of "religion," and "religious."—*And him shalt thou serve*] viz. in acts of public devotion, the spontaneous outcome, and the natural expression, of religious reverence ($10^{12.20}$ 11^{13} $13^{5(4)}$ 28^{47} Ex. 23^{25} Is. 19^{23} &c).

No doubt the word was also used more widely, so as to include the performance of other duties belonging to a religious life; but its primary sense of executing definite and formal acts of worship is apparent from such passages as Ex. 3^{12} 4^{23} 7^{16} 10^{26} 13^{5} ("to serve this service," of the Feast of Unleavened Cakes): cf. c. $12^{2.30}$. In the Priests' Code, both the verb and the subst. (עָבַד, עֲבֹדָה) are used technically of the performance of sacred duties by priests and Levites (*e.g.* Nu. 4^{47} 16^{9}).

And by his name shalt thou swear] so 10^{20}. A person taking

11. ואָכלתָ] in contin. of כי יביאך (v.^{10}): Dr. § 115.—ושׂבָעתּ] Dr. § 104; G-K. § 49. 3*c*.—**13.** Notice (thrice) the emph. position of the obj. (cf. 1^{38}).

Digitized by Google

an oath invokes naturally the name of the God whom he reveres; an oath is accordingly a peculiarly solemn confession of faith. The Israelite is to swear by Jehovah Himself, not by Baʿal (Jer. 12^{16}) or even by idolatrous representations of Jehovah (Am. 8^{14}): a blessing is promised by Jeremiah to those who swear by Him faithfully (Jer. 4^{2} 12^{16}). "He that sweareth by Jehovah" (Ps. $63^{12\,(11)}$) is thus a synonym of Jehovah's true worshipper: cf. Is. 48^{1}.—**14.** *Go after*] 4^{3} 8^{19} 11^{28} 13^{3} (of following Jehovah, v.^{5}) 28^{14}.—*Other gods*] Ex. 20^{3} (=Dt. 5^{7}) 23^{13} Dt. 7^{4} 8^{19} $11^{16.\,28}$ $13^{3.\,7.\,14}$ 17^{3} 18^{20} $28^{14.\,36.\,64}$ $29^{25\,(26)}$ 30^{17} $31^{18.\,20}$; Jos. 23^{13} $24^{2.\,16}$. The expression, though found occasionally elsewhere, is specially characteristic of writers of the Deuteronomic school (in particular, compiler of Kings, and Jer.: not in Is., or other prophets. Comp. the Introd. § 5).—**15.** *A jealous God*] on 4^{24}.—*In the midst of thee*] on 1^{42}: cf. 7^{21} $23^{15\,(14)}$ Jos. 3^{10} Hos. 11^{9} Jer. 14^{9} *al.*—*Destroy* (השמיד)] 1^{27}.

16–19. Israel is not to put Jehovah to the test, but rather to obey His commandments, in order that prosperity may attend it.—16. *Ye shall not put Jehovah to the proof, &c.*] by calling in question, for instance, His presence amongst them, as they had done formerly at Massah (Ex. $17^{2.\,7}$; cf. Dt. 9^{22} 33^{8} Ps. 95^{8}), or by doubting His word.

Tempt is a misleading rendering; for to *tempt* has, in modern English, acquired the sense of *provoking* or *enticing* a person *in order that* he may act in a particular way (=Heb. הֵסִית): נִסָּה is a neutral word, and means to *test* or *prove* a person, to see *whether* he will act in a particular way (Ex. 16^{4} Jud. 2^{22} 3^{4}), or *whether* the character he bears is well established (1 K. 10^{1}). God thus *proves* a person, or *puts* him *to the test*, to see if his fidelity or affection is sincere, Gn. 22^{1} Ex. 20^{20} Dt. 8^{2} (*q.v.*), $13^{4\,(3)}$, cf. Ps. 26^{2}; and men *test*, or *prove*, Jehovah when they act as if doubting whether His promise be true, or whether He is faithful to His revealed character, Ex. $17^{2.\,7}$ Nu. 14^{22} Ps. 78^{18} (see v.^{19})$^{.\,41.\,56}$ 95^{9} 106^{14}, cf. Is. 7^{12}. So *massōth* 4^{34} 7^{19} $29^{2\,(3)}$ are not "temptations," but *trials*, *provings* (see note on 4^{34}).

Massah] i.e. *Proving* (Ex. 17^{7}).—**17.** *Testimonies*] 4^{45}.—*Hath commanded thee*] on 4^{5} $5^{29\,(32)}$.—**18.** *Shalt do that which is right and good in Jehovah's eyes*] so 12^{28} 2 Ch. 14^{1} 31^{20}. Usually without "and good"; and in that form, a phrase used frequently by Deut. writers, esp. the compiler of Kings: see 12^{25} $13^{19\,(18)}$

15. פן יחרה . . . והשמידך] on 4^{16}.—**18.** ובאת וירשת] on 4^{1}; and Dr. § 110. 4.

Digitized by Google

21^{9} Ex. 15^{26} 1 K. 11$^{33.38}$ &c. (Introd. § 5). The correlative, *To do that which is evil in the eyes of Jehovah*, is yet more frequent in writers of the same school: Dt. 4^{25} 9^{18} 17^{2} 31^{29} Jud. 2^{11} 3$^{7.12}$ &c. (see *ibid.*).—*That it may be well for thee*] 5^{16}. —*That thou mayest go in, &c.*] 4^{1}.—*The good land*] 1^{35}.—**19.** *To thrust out* (הדף)] a rare word, occurring besides in this application only 9^{4} Jos. 23^{5} (D^{2}).—*As Jehovah hath spoken*] cf. Ex. 23$^{27\,ff.}$.

20–25. The children of successive generations are to be instructed in the origin and scope of the law now set before Israel.—20. *When thy son asketh thee in time to come* (lit. *to-morrow*), *saying*] *verbatim* as Ex. 13^{14}, in a similar inquiry. —*Testimonies*] 4^{45}.—**21.** *Brought us forth, &c.*] cf. Ex. 13^{14}. *Mighty hand*] 3^{24}.—**22.** *Signs and portents*] 4^{34}.—*Before our eyes*] 4^{34}.—**23.** *But us* (emph.) *he brought out*] cf. 4^{20}.—**24.** *To fear, &c.*] Jehovah, that He might complete His redemptive work towards Israel, gave it this law, to keep alive in it the spirit of true religion, and to secure in perpetuity its national welfare. —*For good to us continually*] 10^{13} (cf. on 4^{40}).—*To keep us alive*] cf. on 4^{1}.—*As at this day*] on 2^{30}.—**25.** And if we are careful to observe this law, we shall have done all that we are required to do, and shall be accounted righteous before Him.— *It shall be righteousness unto us*] cf. 24^{13} (which makes it not improbable that the words "before Jehovah our God" have here been accidentally misplaced, and that they ought to follow "unto us"); also Gn. 15^{6} Ps. 106^{31}.

VII. 1–5. In the land of Canaan, the Israelites are not to mingle with the native inhabitants, but to extirpate them completely, and to destroy all their religious symbols.—1. *When Jehovah thy God shall bring thee into the land*] so 6^{10} 11^{29}.—*And shall clear away*] see below.—*The Ḥittite* (1), *and*

20. מחר]=*in time to come*, as Ex. 13^{14} Jos. 4$^{6.21}$ *al.*—**23.** אותנו] emph.: 4$^{14.20}$.—**24.** לטוב לנו] 10^{13} Jer. 32^{39}; cf. לרע ל Jer. 7^{6} 25^{7}.—כהיום הזה] the art., exceptionally, not elided after כ, as happens 6 times (on 2^{30}) in this phrase, and occasionally besides (see on 2 S. 21^{20}; G-K. § 35. 2 R.^{2}).

VII. 1. נשל] so v.^{22}; 2 K. 16^{6} (Piel); in Ex. 3^{5} Jos. 5^{15}† of drawing off a sandal. Arab. *nashala* is *extraxit* (*e.g.* carnem ex lebete): in Ex. 2^{10} Saad. =Heb. משיתיו. נשל in 19^{5} 28^{40} is a different word, corresponding to the Arab. *nasala*, to *drop off* (of a hair, feathers, &c.).

Digitized by Google

the Girgashite (2), *and the Amorite* (3), *and the Canaanite* (4), *and the Perizzite* (5), *and the Ḥivite* (6), *and the Jebusite* (7)] such enumerations of the nations of Canaan are common, esp. in JE (in many cases probably—Jos. 24^{11} is one that is very clear—introduced by the compiler) and Deut. writers.

Thus (representing the several nations, for brevity, by the figures just attached to them) we have Ex. 3^{8} and ^{17} (4 1 3 5 6 7). 13^{5} (4 1 3 6 7). 23^{23} (3 1 5 4 6 7). 23^{28} (6 4 1). 33^{2} (4 3 1 5 6 7). 34^{11} (3 4 1 5 6 7). Dt. 20^{17} (1 3 4 5 6 7). Jos. 3^{10} (4 1 6 5 2 3 7). 9^{1} and 12^{8} (1 3 4 5 6 7). 11^{3} (4 3 1 5 7 6). 24^{11} (3 5 4 1 2 6 7). Jud. 3^{5} (4 1 3 5 6 7). 1 K. 9^{20} (3 1 5 6 7)=2 Ch. 8^{7} (1 3 5 6 7). See also Ezr. 9^{1} Neh. 9^{8}. The fullest enumeration is Gn. 15^{19-21} (1 5 3 4 2 7, + the Ḳenite, the Ḳenizzite, the Ḳadmonite, and the Rephaim). Nu. 13^{29} is somewhat different, on account of the topographical character of the notices contained in it (cf. p. 11). *Seven* nations are enumerated only Dt. 7^{1} Jos. 3^{10} 24^{11} (both D^{2}): but 𝔊 often completes the same number by inserting 2 before 6 7. In Gn. 13^{7} 34^{30} (both J) Jud. $1^{4.5}$ (also perhaps J) 4 5 are specified alone. Five of the nations here named (viz. 1 7 3 2 6), together with some others, are also included in J's ethnographical table in Gn. 10^{15-18}, where they are described as "begotten" by Canaan; *i.e.* being tribes inhabiting in common the country of Canaan, their relationship to each other is expressed by their being represented as the children of an eponymous ancestor, "Canaan." Cf. Budde, *Die Bibl. Urgesch.* p. 344 ff.

The intention of these enumerations is obviously rhetorical, rather than geographical or historical; they are designed for the purpose of presenting an impressive picture of the number and variety of the nations dispossessed by the Israelites. Elsewhere (see p. 11) the Amorite and Canaanite, the two principal tribes which once occupied Palestine, stand alone as representing the pre-Israelitish population: in the present lists, the minor tribes, living beside them in particular localities, are included as well.

The *Ḥittites* will have been a branch or offshoot of the great nation of Ḥatti, whose capital city was Ḳadesh on the Orontes, N. of Canaan (cf. 2 S. 24^{6} 𝔏 Χιττιιμ Καδης for "Taḥtim Ḥodshi), and the extent of whose empire (cf. 1 K. 10^{29} 11^{1} 2 K. 7^{6}) is attested by notices in the Assyrian and Egyptian Inscriptions, and by their own monuments (at present undecyphered); the reference is probably in particular to parts in the extreme N. of Canaan, under Lebanon and Ḥermon, which are alluded to elsewhere as having been in their occupation; comp. Jud. 1^{26} 3^{3} (*Ḥittite* for *Ḥivite*) Jos. 11^{3} 𝔊 (*Ḥivite* for *Ḥittite*, and then "the *Ḥittite* under Ḥermon"). The *Girgashites* are named besides only in the lists Gn. 10^{16} (=1 Ch. 1^{14}) 15^{21} Jos. 3^{10} 24^{11} Neh. 9^{8}†, without any indication of the locality which they inhabited. On the *Amorite*, and the *Canaanite*, see p. 11. The *Perizzites* are mentioned (apart from the lists quoted above) in

Digitized by Google

Gn. 13^{7} 34^{30} Jud. $1^{4.5}$ (in each case beside the Canaanite), Jos. 17^{15} (beside the Rephaim), apparently as living in the centre of Palestine, in the neighbourhood of Bethel and Shechem. The name is derived possibly from the same root as פרזי (on 3^{5}), in which case it will signify properly *dwellers in the open country.* From the Perizzites not being named among the descendants of Canaan in Gn. 10^{15-18}, it has been conjectured (Riehm, *HWB.*[1] p. 1193; Dillm. on Gn. 10^{15}) that they were the survivors of the pre-Canaanitish population of Palestine, expelled from their strongholds by the Canaanite invaders, but maintaining themselves beside their conquerors in the open country. The *Ḥivites* appear in Shechem and Gibe'on (Gn. 34^{2} Jos. 9^{7} 11^{19}; cf. 2 S. 24^{7}): the *Jebusites* are well known as the tribe whose stronghold was the fortress of Jerusalem (Jos. 18^{28} Jud. 1^{21} 2 S. 5^{6} *al.*).

Greater and mightier than thou] cf. v.^{17} 4^{38} 9^{1} 11^{23}.—**2.** *Deliver up before*] 1^{8}.—*Thou shalt devote them*] or *ban* them. An archaic institution often alluded to in the OT. As Arabic shows, the term used means properly *to separate* or *seclude*; in Heb. (as in Moabitish) it was applied in particular to denote *separation* to a deity. Mesha' in his Inscription, l. 16–18, tells how, after he had succeeded in carrying off the "vessels of Yahweh" from Nebo (Nu. 32^{38}), and "dragged" them before Chemosh, he "devoted" 7000 Israelitish prisoners to 'Ashtor-Chemosh (כי לעשתר כמש החרמתי). In Israel, the usage was utilized so as to harmonize with the principles of their religion and to satisfy its needs. It became a mode of secluding, or rendering harmless, anything imperilling the religious life of the nation, such objects being withdrawn from society at large, and presented to the sanctuary, which had power, if necessary, to authorize their destruction. It was thus applied, in particular, for the purpose of checking idolatry. It is mentioned first in the Book of the Covenant, Ex. $22^{19(20)}$, of the disloyal Israelite, זֹבֵחַ לָאֱלֹהִים יָחֳרָם בִּלְתִּי לַיהוָה לְבַדּוֹ. More commonly the חֵרֶם is prescribed for the case of those outside the community of Israel: here and v.$^{25f.}$ 20^{16-18} for the idolatrous Canaanites: in $13^{13-19(12-18)}$ the idolatrous Israelite city is to be treated similarly. The "devotion" of a city involved the death of all human beings resident in it: the cattle and spoil were destroyed, or not, at the same time, according to the gravity of the occasion (contrast Dt. $2^{34f.}$ and 1 S. 15^{3}).

Instances of the *ḥérem* being put in force (which is referred to with esp. frequency by D and D[2]) are: Nu. $21^{2f.}$ (JE), after a vow; Dt. $2^{34f.}$ $3^{6f.}$

Digitized by Google

Jos. 2^{10} $10^{1. 28. 35. 37. 39. 40}$ $11^{11. 12. 20. 21}$ (all D²), $6^{17-19. 21}$ (cf. 7^{11-13}) $8^{2. 26}$; Jud. $21^{10f.}$; 1 S. $15^{3. 8. 9. 15}$ (the whole spoil was here made *ḥérem*, or "devoted": a part of it was afterwards reserved by Saul, as it was secreted by ʿAchan on a similar occasion, Jos. $7^{1. 11-13}$). In AV. הֶחֱרִים is usually rendered "utterly destroy," and חֵרֶם "accursed thing"; but these terms both express secondary ideas, besides being apparently unrelated to each other; in RV. "utterly destroy" has been mostly retained for החרים, with "Heb. *devote*" on the margin, and חרם being rendered "devoted thing," the connexion between the two cognate terms is preserved. For fig. uses of both, see Is. 11^{15} (unless החריב should here be read) 34^{2} Jer. 25^{9} Mic. 4^{13} Mal. 3^{24} (4^{6}); 1 K. 20^{42} (איש חרמי) Is. 34^{5} (עם חרמי).—The root is the Arab. *ḥarama*, to *shut off*, *prohibit*, whence the *ḥarîm* or sacred τέμενος of the Temple at Mecca, and the *ḥarîm*, the secluded apartment of the women, applied also to its occupants, *i.e.* the "harem."

Thou shalt make no covenant with them] so Ex. 23^{32}, cf. 34^{12} (both JE).—**3.** *Nor join thyself in marriage with them*] lit. make thyself חָתָן, or son-in-law: so Jos. 23^{12} (D²); cf. Gn. 34^{9} 1 S. 18^{21}.—*Nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son*] cf. Ex. 34^{16a}.—**4.** *For he will turn away thy son from following me*] Ex. 34^{16b}.—*Me*] the discourse of Moses passing insensibly into that of God, as very often in the prophets: so $11^{14f.}$ 17^{3} 28^{20} $29^{4f.}$.—*Quickly*] cf. 4^{26} 28^{20}.—**5.** All objects worshipped, or held sacred, by the Canaanites are to be destroyed.—*Their altars ye shall break down, and their pillars ye shall dash in pieces, and their Ashérim ye shall hew down*] repeated verbally from Ex. 34^{13} (cf. 23^{24}), with the single change of *cut* into *hew*: cf. Dt. 12^{3}. On the "pillars" or "obelisks" (מַצֵּבוֹת), and "Ashérim" (אֲשֵׁרִים), see on $16^{21. 22}$.

6–11. The ground of the preceding prohibitions: Israel is sacred to Jehovah, and motives of gratitude, not less than of fear, should impel it to obedience.—6. *For thou art an holy people, &c.*] based, with rhetorical variations, upon Ex. 19^{5-6} ("ye shall be unto me a *peculiar possession* out of all the peoples, . . . an *holy nation*"), the classical passage defining the terms of the covenant between Jehovah and His people.—*An holy people*] so $14^{2. 21}$ 26^{19}, cf. 28^{9}. Comp. Ex. 22^{30} ואנשי קדש

4. יסיר . . . מאחרי] cf. סר מאחרי י׳ 1 S. 12^{20}.—**5.** תְּנַתֵּצוּ . . . תְּגַדֵּעוּן] notice the emphatic pausal form, with the smaller distinctive accent *Zaqef*, at points at which the voice would naturally rest: cf. Gn. 15^{14} יַעֲבֹדוּ, Jer. 35^{7} תִּזְרָעוּ . . . תִטָּעוּ, Hos. 4^{13} יְקַטֵּרוּ, 8^{7} יִזְרָעוּ; and frequently.—אשיריהם] with ׳, as Mic. 5^{13} 2 K. 17^{16}†.—**6.** בך בחר י׳] for the position of בך, cf. 14^{2} 18^{5} 21^{5}; also Gn. 2^{3} Ex. 23^{15} 2 K. 5^{1} Ps. 28^{7} 33^{21} 63^{9} 91^{14} 104^{20}.

Digitized by Google

תהין לי (see on 14^{21}). The holiness of Israel, partly ceremonial, partly moral, as a quality demanded of Israel by Jehovah the Holy One, is insisted on with great emphasis in the Code of laws contained in Lev. 17–26, often now termed, in consequence of this characteristic, the "Law of Holiness" (*L.O.T.* p. 43 ff.)—*Chosen*] first used as a theological term, denoting God's choice of Israel (though the idea, expressed more generally, occurs before, *e.g.* Am. 3^{2} Ex. $19^{5\text{-}6}$), in Dt. (4^{37} 7^{7} 10^{15} 14^{2}): so Jer. 33^{24}, and in II Isaiah, Is. $41^{8.\,9}$ $43^{10.\,20}$ $44^{1.\,2}$ 45^{4}, also (of the future) Is. 14^{1} $65^{9.\,15.\,22}$, and of Jehovah's ideal servant, 42^{1} 49^{7}. Comp. on 12^{5}.—*A peculiar people*] עַם סְגֻלָּה, *i.e.* "a people of special possession," a people specially treasured, and prized, by Jehovah ("peculiar" being used in the sense of the Lat. *peculiaris*, from *peculium*, a technical term denoting the private property which a child or slave was allowed by parent or master to possess): so 14^{2} 26^{18}. The force of סְגֻלָּה appears from 1 Ch. 29^{3} Eccl. 2^{8}, where it is used of a private treasure (of gold, silver, &c.) belonging to kings. It is applied to Israel in the fundamental passage Ex. 19^{5} (והייתם לי סגלה); whence also Ps. 135^{4}, and (of the faithful Israelites in the future) Mal. 3^{17} (see RV.).—**7–8.** Jehovah has thus chosen and redeemed Israel, not on account of its numbers, but because He loved it and would not forget His promise to its forefathers.—**7.** *The smallest of all the peoples*] cf. v.^{1} 4^{38} 9^{1} 11^{23}: contrast 1^{10} 10^{22} ("as the stars of heaven"), 4^{6} 26^{5} ("great nation"). The representation of Israel's numbers and power appears to vary, in different passages, according to the thought which the Writer at the time desires to impress.—**8.** *Loved you*] so v.^{13} 23^{6} (cf. the love for the patriarchs 4^{37} 10^{15}). The doctrine of Jehovah's *love* of Israel is not expressed elsewhere in the Pent.; and if the date assigned to Dt. by critics be correct, it is first taught by the prophet Hosea, who conceives the relation of Jehovah to His people as a *moral union*, marked by love and affection on the one side, and demanding a corresponding love and affection on the other. In Hos. 1–3 the figure of the

7. חשק] 10^{15} 21^{11}. Rare (Gn. 34^{8} Ps. 91^{14}; Is. 38^{17} 1 K. 9^{19}=2 Ch. 8^{6}†).—המעט] the art. gives to מעט the force of a superlative,—"the fewest" (*Lex.* ה 1 b).—**8.** מאהבת י' אתכם] cf. 1^{27}. מן as v.^{7} 9^{28} Ez. 35^{11}.

Digitized by Google

marriage-tie is effectively applied for the purpose of symbolizing this: in Hos. 11^{1-4} Jehovah is represented as cherishing towards His people the love and affection of a father; comp. 3^{1} 9^{15}, and (in the promise for the future) $14^{5(4)}$. In later prophets the idea recurs Jer. 31^{3} Is. 43^{4} 63^{9} Mal. 1^{2}, and (of the future) Zeph. 3^{17}. See further W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, p. 154 ff.; Cheyne's *Hosea* (in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*), pp. 15 ff., 22 ff.; and the author's *Sermons on the O.T.* (1892), p. 222 f.—*The oath which he sware, &c.*] cf. 9^{5b}; see on 1^{8}.—*A mighty hand*] 3^{24}.—*Ransomed thee* (ויפדך)] here used fig. of deliverance from the "house of bondage" (6^{12}).

In its technical sense פדה means *to ransom* a person, or animal, from death, either by a substitute, or by payment of a sum of money (Ex. $13^{13.15}$ 34^{20} Nu. $18^{15.16.17}$, of ransoming the firstborn), comp. Ex. 21^{8} Lev. 19^{20} of ransoming a woman, who has been betrothed: it is then often applied figuratively to deliverance from trouble, danger, death, &c. (2 S. 4^{9} 1 K. 1^{29} Is. 29^{22} Hos. 13^{14} Ps. 26^{11} 78^{42} Job 5^{20} *al.*); as here, of the deliverance from Egypt, 9^{26} 13^{6} 15^{15} 21^{8} 24^{18} (not so elsewhere in the Pent.); comp. 2 S. 7^{23}, and esp. Mic. 6^{4} (ומבית עבדים פדיתיך). The primary sense of the synonym גאל, Ex. 6^{6} (P), 15^{13} (the Song), is different: גאל is properly *to resume a claim or right* which has lapsed, *to reclaim, re-vindicate*; it is thus used Lev. $25^{25ff.}$ of the redemption of a house or field, after it has been sold (cf. Jer. $32^{7.8}$); Dt. 19^{6} *al.* (see note), in the expression גֹּאֵל הַדָּם, it denotes the person who vindicates the rights of a murdered man, *i.e.* the "avenger of blood." Like פדה, גאל is then also used metaphorically of release from trouble of various kinds (*e.g.* Gn. 48^{16} Hos. 13^{14} ‖ פדה, Jer. 31^{11} ‖ *id.*, Ps. 69^{19} 72^{14} 103^{4}; and esp. in II Isaiah, of Jehovah's reclaiming His people from exile in Babylon, Is. 41^{14} 43^{1} 44^{23} &c.). The fig. use of the two words varies, however, in different books; thus in the Psalms פדה is more common than גאל, in II Isaiah גאל is the usual term.

9–10. And Israel's God is one Who rewardeth with equal justice both those who love Him, and those that hate Him. Vv. 9–10 are an exposition of the 2nd Commandment of the Decalogue.—**9.** *He is the God* (האלהים)] $4^{35.39}$; cf. 10^{17}.—*The faithful God*] cf. v.[8] Is. 49^{7}: also Ex. 34^{6} (רב חסד ואמת). אֱמֶת *faithfulness* (not *truth*)—*i.e.* fidelity to His promise, or revealed character—is an attribute which is frequently mentioned as characterizing Jehovah, Gn. 24^{27} Ps. 30^{10} 31^{6} 43^{3} *al.*—*Which keepeth the covenant and the loving-kindness*] i.e. *the* covenant and *the* loving-kindness, which He has promised before, and which are familiarly known.

9. וְיָדַעְתָּ] on 4^{16}. So v.[11].—הוא] 3^{22}.—האלהים] 4^{35} 2 K. 19^{15} Is. 45^{18} (p. 91).

Digitized by Google

חסד is a wider and more comprehensive term than "mercy": "mercy" is properly the quality by which a person renounces, out of motives of benevolence or compassion, his legitimate rights against one, for instance, who has offended or injured him; but חסד is a quality exercised mutually amongst equals; it is the kindliness of feeling, consideration, and courtesy, which adds a grace and softness to the relations subsisting between members of the same society (comp. the common expression, "to do חסד and faithfulness with a person," Gn. 24^{49} 47^{29} Jos. 2^{14} &c., *i.e.* to show towards one the kindness and faithfulness of a true friend). The force of חסד is most adequately represented by *kindness* (Hos. 4^{1} $6^{4.6}$ $12^{7(6)}$), or when applied to God—for the term is too strong to be used generally of men—*loving-kindness*. Cf. W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, pp. 160 ff., 406 f.

To them that love him (6^{5}), *&c.*, *to a thousand generations*] Ex. 20^{6} "doing loving-kindness unto thousands, related to (לְ) them that love me, and keep my commandments." The "thousands" of the 2nd Commandment does not mean definitely to the thousandth descendant of the godly man, but, in virtue of the solidarity of the family or the tribe (which was much more strongly felt in antiquity than in modern times: comp. *e.g.* Jos. $7^{24f.}$ 2 S. 21^{1-14} c. 24), it denotes thousands of those *belonging to*, or *connected with*, him, whether by domestic, or social, or national ties: those who *love* God, and in virtue of that love, experience the tokens of His favour, form, as it were, centres, whence, upon thousands brought within range of their influence, the blessings of His mercy are diffused abroad. The אֶלֶף דּוֹר of Dt. 7^{9} is thus a rhetorical amplification, rather than an exact interpretation, of the אֲלָפִים of Ex. 20^{6}.—10. *Repaying them that hate him to their face; he deferreth* (it) *not*, *&c.*] stress is laid on the fact that the evil-doer, whether or not his descendants suffer likewise (Ex. 20^{5}), is requited *in person* for his misdeeds: cf. 24^{16} (see note), Job 21^{19} יְשַׁלֵּם אֵלָיו וְיֵדָע (Job's wish: see RV.).—11. The practical duty based upon Jehovah's moral dealings with men, the obligation, viz. upon Israel's part, of obeying the commandments now laid before it.—*The commandment*, *&c.*] $5^{28(31)}$ 6^{1}.

12–16. The reward of Israel's obedience will be prosperity and health.—The passage in general character resembles the exhortation, Ex. 23^{25-27}, at the end of the "Book of the

10. אל פניו] cf. Job 13^{15}. The *sing.* suff. (cf. להאבידו), after לשנאיו, individualizing: cf. (if the text be always sound) 7^{3b} Lev. 21^{7} 25^{31} Jud. $1^{16b.34b}$ 7^{4} 12^{3} $20^{32b.42}$ Ps. 12^{8} $17^{12f.}$ (see $^{10f.}$) 35^{8} 41^{7} $55^{21f.}$ 73^{6b} Jer. 22^{4b} (G-K. § 145. 5 R.).

Digitized by Google

Covenant," and contains reminiscences from it.—**12.** *Because*] see below.—*Will keep for thee*] v.$^{9. 8}$.—*The covenant, &c.*] 4^{31}.—**13.** *And bless thee and multiply thee*] Gn. 22^{17} $26^{3f. 24}$.—*The fruit of thy womb* (בטנך)] $28^{4. 11. 18. 51. 53}$ 30^{9}: cf. Gn. 30^{2} Mic. 6^{7} Is. 13^{18} Ps. 127^{3} 132^{11}†.—*Corn* . . ., *wine* . . ., *oil*] the three chief products of the soil of Palestine, often named together in similar passages: 11^{14} 12^{17} 14^{23} 18^{4} 28^{51} Hos. $2^{10. 24 (8. 22)}$ Jer. 31^{12} *al.* The terms used denote these products in an unmanufactured state,—relatively (תִּירוֹשׁ), if not absolutely (יִצְהָר, דָּגָן)—דָּגָן not לֶחֶם, תִּירוֹשׁ not יַיִן, יִצְהָר not שֶׁמֶן. תירוש, though not entirely unfermented, or harmless (Hos. 4^{11}), was nevertheless a much fresher extract of the grape than יין (cf. Mic. 6^{15} Is. 65^{8} Jud. 9^{13}).—*Increase . . . young*] on the rare words thus rendered, see below.—*Upon the ground which he sware, &c.*] $11^{9. 21}$ 28^{11} 30^{20} 31^{20}.—**14.** *Or female barren*] Ex. 23^{26}.—*In thee*] on 15^{4}.—**15.** *Will remove from thee all sickness*] Ex. 23^{25} והסירותי מחלה מקרבך.—*Will put none, &c.*] cf. Ex. 15^{26} (JE) כל המחלה אשר שמתי במצרים לא אשים עליך.—*Evil diseases of Egypt*] cf. $28^{27. 35}$ (the שחין מצרים) ^{60}.—*Which thou knowest*] cf. אשר ראית 1^{31}. The climate of Egypt is unhealthy, especially at certain seasons of the year, elephantiasis and other skin complaints, dysentery, and ophthalmia being particularly prevalent (cf. Hengstenberg, *Die Bb. Mose's und Aeg.* p. 225 f.; and Pruner, *Krankheiten des Orients*, p. 460 ff., referred to by Dillm.). All such diseases, it is promised, if Israel be obedient, will be laid by Jehovah upon its foes.—**16.** The paragraph ends (cf. Ex. $23^{22f.}$) with a renewed inculcation of what

12. עקב תשמעון] *in reward for* (the fact) that ye hearken = *because* ye hearken: so 8^{20}. Cf. Am. 4^{12} (עקב כי). More often of past time, Gn. 22^{18} *al.*—ושמרתם] with a frequent. force: Dr. § 115 (*s.v.* עקב).—לך] *for* thee, on thy behoof: so זכר ל Lev. 26^{45} *al.*—**13.** שְׁגַר אלפיך] so $28^{4. 18. 51}$; שֶׁגֶר בהמה Ex. 13^{12} (JE)†. The root is preserved in the Aram. שְׁגַר *to drop*, *e.g.* tears Jer. 13^{17}, שַׁגֵּר *to cast forth* (a corpse) c. 28^{26}, *to drop* (young) Ex. 13^{12} Ps.-Jon. On the *st. c.* שְׁגַר, *v.* G-K. § 93 R.[1] B; Stade, § 191^{c}.—עשתרת צאנך] so $28^{4. 18. 51}$†. The expression is peculiar (lit. "the *ʿAshtōreths* of thy flock"); it must have its origin in the name of the goddess *ʿAshtōreth*, and appears to show that this deity, under one of her types, had the form of a sheep (*v.* W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.* 457 f., cf. 292).—**14.** לא יהיה בך עקר ועקרה ובבהמתך] לא יהיה בך ובבהמתך ע׳ וע׳ might seem to be a neater and more logical sentence; but there are many examples of a similar order in Heb.: *e.g.* 1^{36} (see note), $28^{54a. 56a}$ Gn. 2^{9b} 12^{17a} 28^{14b} 41^{27} $43^{15. 18}$ Ex. 34^{27b}.—**15.** מדוי] 28^{60}†.

Digitized by Google

is here foremost in the Writer's thought (v.$^{1ff.}$), the destruction of the Canaanites.—*Shalt devour*] lit. *eat* (אכל), a semi-poetical usage, Jer. 10^{25} 30^{16} 50^{7}: cf. "our bread," Nu. 14^{9}.—*Thine eye shalt not pity them*] $13^{9\,(8)}$ $19^{13.\,21}$ 25^{12}: the same idiom also Gn. 45^{20} Is. 13^{18}, and often in Ez. Cf. v.^{2} לֹא תְחָנֵּם.—*Neither shalt thou serve their gods, &c.*] varied from Ex. 23^{33} כי תעבד אלהיהם כי יהיה לך למוקש: cf. 34^{12}.

17–24. In its struggle with the nations of Canaan, let Israel rest assured that Jehovah will still be present with His aid.—17. *If thou shalt say in thine heart*] 18^{21}; cf. 9^{4}.—**18.** *What Jehovah thy God did, &c.*] cf. 4^{34} $6^{21f.}$.—**19.** *Provings*] 4^{34}.—*Which thine eyes saw*] 4^{9}.—**20.** *And the hornet also*] Ex. 23^{28} ושלחתי את־הצרעה לפניך, cf. Jos. 24^{12} (E or D^{2}). The hornet is named ("and *also*") as a specially terrible plague, by which Israel was to be aided in the expulsion of the Canaanites; it would penetrate even into the hiding-places in which "those who were left" of the Canaanites had taken refuge, and force them to relinquish them. Two of the four species of hornet found in Palestine construct their nests underground or in cavities of rocks: and should a horse tread on a nest, it is necessary to fly with all speed; for the combined attack from such a swarm has been known to be fatal (*DB.*^{2} *s.v.*).—**21.** *In the midst of thee*] 6^{15}.—*Terrible*] 10^{17}, cf. 28^{58}.—**22.** *Shall clear away* (v.^{1}) *these nations by little and little, &c.*] varied from Ex. $23^{30.\,29b}$. *Quickly* is of course a relative term, and must be understood here of a shorter period than in 9^{3} (cf. a similar divergence of representation in the note on v.^{7}): it corresponds to "in one year" in Ex. 23^{29}.—**23–24.** The destruction of the Canaanites will be complete.—**23.** *Deliver up before thee*]

19. אשר הוציאך] an extreme case of אשר used as a mere link of connexion between two sentences: = *wherewith*; cf. 28^{20} 1 S. 2^{32} Jud. 8^{15} (*Lex.* אשר 4 c).—**21.** לא תערץ] 1^{29}.—**22.** האל] 4^{42}.—מעט מעט] so Ex. 23^{30}; cf. c. 28^{43}. The repetition expresses gradual progress; G-K. § 133. 3 R.^{3}—לא תוכל] expressing a *moral* possibility = "thou *mayest* not,"—a usage of יכל almost confined to Dt. (12^{17} 16^{5} 17^{15} 21^{16} $22^{3.\,19.\,29}$ 24^{4}; Gen. 43^{32}).—**23.** וְהָמָם] "pointed as though from הום on account of מהומה" (Dillm.). Elsewhere the verb in use is הָמַם (2^{15} *al.*), of which, however, in the pf. only the uncontracted form occurs before suffixes (Je. 51^{34} הֲמָמַנִי; 2 Ch. 15^{6} הֲמָמָם); perhaps הַמָּם was avoided as a solœcism (cf. König, i. p. 486).—עד השמדם] cf. עד השמדך $28^{20.\,24.\,45.\,51.\,61}$.—לא יתיצב איש בפניך] so 11^{25};

Digitized by Google

varied from Ex. 23^{27}: see on 1^{8}.—*Discomfit*] Ex. 23^{27a}.—*A great discomfiture*] 1 S. 5^{9} 14^{20}.—**24.** *Their kings*] Jos. 10$^{22ff.}$ 11^{12} 12$^{7ff.}$.—*Make their name to perish from under heaven*] cf. with *blot out* (מחה) 9^{14} 25^{19} 29^{19}.—*Stand in thy face*] 11^{25}; see below.

25–26. But in the hour of victory, let not Israel be tempted to make truce with the idolatry of Canaan.—25. *Their graven images ye shall burn with fire*] repeated from v.^{5}.—*The silver and the gold upon them*] *i.e.* the precious metal with which the wooden core, or framework of the idol, was overlaid: cf. Is. 30^{22} 40^{19} Hab. 2^{19}.—*Lest thou be snared by it*] *i.e.* (the reference being not to the images, but to the precious metal upon them) not "be seduced into idolatry," but "be brought into misfortune," through God's judgment being provoked by the idolatrous relic.—*An abomination of Jehovah thy God* (תועבת יהוה אלהיך)] similarly, as the final ground of a prohibition, 17^{1} 18^{12} 22^{5} 23^{10} 24^{4} 25^{16}: cf. 7^{26} 12^{31} 13^{15} 14^{3} 17^{4} 27^{15} 32^{16}. Never so in JE; in the "Law of Holiness" (Lev. 17–26), comp. Lev. 18$^{22.26.27.29.30}$ 20^{13} (but *only* of sins of unchastity). The expression *Jehovah's abomination* also occurs frequently in the Book of Proverbs (11^{20} 12^{22} 15^{8} *al.*).—**26.** *And become a devoted thing* (חֵרֶם) *like it*] the

with עמד Jos. 10^{8} 21^{42} 23^{9}†: cf. התיצב לפני 9^{2} Jos. 1^{5}. בפני is stronger than לפני, expressing not merely *before*, but *in the face of*, *against*, in a hostile sense: cf. ענה בפני to answer *against*, Job 16^{8} Hos. 5^{5}; ירק בפני to spit *against* or *in* one's face, c. 25^{9}.—עד הִשמדך אתם] similarly 28^{48} Jos. 11^{14}. Of course in these passages, and most probably also in 1 K. 15^{29} 2 K. 10^{17}, the suffix, as in Lev. 14^{43b} (אחרי הִקצות) the form, and in Jer. 50^{34} (למען הִרגיע . . . והִרגיז) the syntax, shows that the punctuators must have recognized an inf. Hif. with *ḥireq* (cf. on 3^{3}). Such a form of the inf. is however highly anomalous, and very insufficiently explained by the suggestion (König, p. 212) that it is due to the analogy of the perfect; for though it is true (Ew. § 238^{d}) that it is usually found after a noun or a nounal prep. (not ב, כ, ל), and so in a position which would readily admit of a finite verb, yet the syntax could not in such cases have actually permitted it; the motive, therefore, though it is one which might have influenced the punctuators, is hardly one that could have determined the pronunciation in the living language. In all probability the punctuation, in these cases, does not represent an original and true tradition; and -הַ should be throughout restored for -הִ. Comp. on 3^{3} 28^{55}. In Lev. 14^{46b} כל ימי הִסגיר אתו, Jer. 51^{33} עת הִדריכה, the syntax will permit הִסגיר and הִדריך to be treated, as they stand, as perfects (see 1 S. 25^{15} Jer. 49^{8} 50^{31}): so also Lev. 14^{43a} אַחַר חִלֵּץ (see Jer. 40^{1}).—**25.** ולקחת לך] under the government of לא in לא תחמד (Dr. § 115, *s.v.* לא). So v.^{26} 19^{10} 22$^{1.4}$ 23^{15}. On לך, see on 1^{13}.

Digitized by Google

tainted metal is to be "devoted" (v.^{2}): the Israelite is to abstain even from bringing it into his house, lest he contract the same taint himself (Jos. 6^{18b} 7^{12}; cf. Jos. $6^{19.24}$ $7^{11.21.24}$).—*Thou shalt utterly detest it*] שִׁקֵּץ, here rendered "detest," is used specially with reference to prohibited kinds of food (Lev. $11^{11.13.43}$ 20^{25}); and the subst. שֶׁקֶץ is used similarly (Lev. 7^{21} $11^{10-13.20.23.41.42}$ Ez. 8^{10} Is. 66^{17}†). שִׁקּוּץ *detestable thing* often denotes false gods or idols (29^{16}, with the note). Both these words are commonly represented in AV., RV., by *abomination*, though this rather corresponds to the more general and ordinary word תּוֹעֵבָה (v.^{25}). It is to be regretted that in the English versions the distinction between the two roots has not been more uniformly preserved.

VIII. The lessons of the wilderness.—1–5. Let Israel remember how their life in the wilderness had been a period of discipline, in which God had taught the infant nation its dependence upon Him.—1. *All the commandment, which, &c.*] $11^{8.22}$ 15^{5} 19^{9} 27^{1}, cf. 6^{25}: comp. on $5^{28(31)}$. The *whole* of the Deut. law—the principle of 11^{22b}, together with all that is involved in it—is to be obeyed by the Israelite. The exhortation of $5^{29f.(32f.)}$ $6^{2f.\ 17-19}$ $7^{11.12}$ is repeated, for the purpose of enforcing it by a fresh motive, v.$^{2ff.}$.—*Observe to do*] 5^{1}.—*That ye may live, &c.*] cf. 4^{1} $5^{30(33)}$ 6^{3}.—*Go in and possess, &c.*] 1^{8}.—**2–6.** The new motive: the recollection of the years spent in the wilderness, and the evidence which they afforded of the loving, yet searching and testing, providence of God.—**2.** *Led thee forty years in the wilderness*] Am. 2^{10}.—*To humble thee*] by teaching thee, viz., thy dependence upon Him; cf. v.$^{3.16}$.—*To prove thee*] cf. on 6^{16}. Hunger (v.^{3}), or other privations, according to the spirit in which they are received, are a test of the temper of those who experience them.—*To know what was in thine heart*] *i.e.* to discover thy real purposes and disposition: cf. 1 S. 14^{7} 2 K. 10^{30} 2 Ch. 32^{31} (לנסותו לדעת כל בלבבו).—*Whether thou wouldest keep, &c.*] cf. esp. Ex. 16^{4} JE (of the manna); Jud. 3^{4}.—**3.** In particular the manna is pointed to, as illustrating the discipline of the

VIII. 1. ורביתם] pf., as 4^{1}.—**2.** זה] 2^{7}.—אִם לֹא . . . הֲ] Ex. 16^{4} Nu. 11^{23} *al.* (*Lex.* הֲ **2 b**).—**3.** יְדָעוּן] so v. ^{16}†. The ן- in the 3rd pl. *perf.*—unlike the ן- in

Digitized by Google

wilderness: Israel's self-sufficiency was "humbled," first by its being suffered to feel a want, and afterwards by the manner in which its want was supplied; it was thus taught how, for its very existence, it was daily (Ex. 16⁴) dependent on the (creative) word of God. On the manna, see Ex. 16 (JE and P), Nu. 11^{4-9} 21^{5} (both JE); and comp. Bacon, *JBLit.* 1892, p. 185 ff.; *Triple Tradition*, pp. 83–86. Further, the manna "proved" Israel (v.[16]: Ex. 16^{4}), by showing, viz. whether or not Israel would accommodate itself, trustfully and contentedly (Nu. 21^{5}), to this state of continued dependence upon God, and whether therefore it could be trusted to obey properly any other laws which might in future be laid upon it. Thus the manna (1) taught Israel its dependence upon Jehovah, and (2) operated as a test of Israel's disposition.—*Which thou knewest not, &c.*] cf. $13^{7(6)}$ $28^{36.64}$. It was a food unknown before (Ex. 16^{15}); and consequently a signal evidence of God's sustaining providence.—*That man doth not live on bread alone, but on every utterance of Jehovah's mouth doth man live*] the didactic treatment of the history continues, a further lesson being based on the narrative of the manna. The narrative showed that the natural products of the earth are not uniformly sufficient for the support of life: the creative will of God, in whatever other way it may, upon occasion, specially exert itself, is also a sustaining power, on which man may find himself obliged to rely. But the words, though originally suggested by the history of the manna, are not limited in their import to that particular occasion: they are of wider application; and they are accordingly quoted by our Lord, in His answer to the tempter (Mt. 4^{4}), for the purpose of showing that needs of sense do not exhaust the requirements of human nature, that man leads a spiritual life as well as a physical

the 2nd and 3rd ps. pl. *impf.* (on 1^{17})—is both anomalous, and philologically questionable. The only other example in the OT. is Is. 26^{16} צָקוּן. The form is met with occasionally in Syriac and other late dialects (as the Palest. Targums and the Jerus. Talmud); but it is difficult to think that the three isolated cases in the OT. are original: had the form been in actual use in ancient Hebrew, the occasions for its employment would surely have been more numerous (*v.* Dr. § 6 *Obs.* 2, p. 6 f., with the reff.).—**3.** על] Gen. 27^{40} Is. 38^{16}.

Digitized by Google

life, and that by yielding inopportunely to physical necessity, higher spiritual needs may be neglected or frustrated.—*Utterance* (מוֹצָא)] on 23^{24}.—**4.** *Thy raiment wore not away from off thee, neither did thy foot blister, these forty years*] a further illustration of God's sustaining providence during the years passed in the wilderness. The terms of the description are rhetorical, and are not of course to be understood literally, as was done, for instance, by the Jews, who even fabled (*v.* Rashi: cf. Just. *c. Tryph.* § 131) that the clothes of the Israelite children grew with their bodies, "like the shell of a snail"! Cf. $29^{4(5)}$ Neh. 9^{21} (a quotation).—**5.** *Know* (4^{39}), *then, with thine heart, that like as a man disciplines his son, Jehovah thy God is disciplining thee*] in the wilderness, Jehovah had been as a father *disciplining* his child (see on 4^{36}; and cf. Pr. 4^{1} 19^{18} 29^{17}), and educating him with a view to his ultimate good (v.[16]). Cf. Hos. $2^{16(14)}$ (the wilderness a place of discipline for renegade Ephraim).—**6.** Let Israel, then, respond with filial obedience.—*And keep*] see below.—*To walk in his ways*] *i.e.* in the ways which He approves, and which He directs men to follow (Ex. 18^{20}): so 19^{9} 26^{17} 28^{9} 30^{16}, with *all* 10^{12} 11^{22} Jos. 22^{5} (D^2) 1 K. 2^{3} 3^{14} 8^{58} $11^{33.38}$ (all Deut.), and occasionally besides. With other verbs, both *way* and *ways* are frequent in the same moral application: *e.g.* Gen. 18^{19} (JE) Ps. $18^{22(21)}$; cf. on 5^{30}.—*To fear him*] $6^{13.24}$.

7–20. Let Israel take heed lest, in the enjoyment of the good things of Canaan, it be tempted to forget the Giver, and ascribe its prosperity to its own natural powers.—7. *For*] the preceding admonition is needful: *for* Israel is about to enter into conditions of life in which the lessons of the past may be only too readily forgotten. The Writer begins by an eloquent and glowing description of the richly-blessed soil of Canaan.—*A good land*] 1^{35}.—*A land of streams*—properly *Wādys* (on 2^{13})—*of water, of springs and deeps, issuing forth in vale and hill*] an attractive and faithful description of the

4. בלתה מעליך] a pregnant constr., "wear away (and drop) from upon thee": so 29^{4}, cf. Job $30^{17.30}$.—בצקה Neh. 9^{21}†.—**5.** וְיָדַעְתָּ] *know, then*, as 7^{9}.—**5.** עם לבבך] for this idiom. use of עם, cf. 15^{9} Jos. 14^{7} 1 K. $8^{17.18}$ 10^{2} (=1 Ch. $6^{7.8}$ 2 Ch. 9^{1}) 1 Ch. 22^{7} 28^{2} 2 Ch. 1^{11} 24^{4} 29^{10}.—ייסר] the impf., as 1^{44}.—**6.** וְשָׁמַרְתָּ] *and keep* (as an imper.), carrying on וידעת.

Digitized by Google

Palestinian landscape. For "deeps" (תְּהֹמֹת), *i.e.* the "waters under the earth," see on 4^{18}. בִּקְעָה is a *vale*, or *plain*,—properly a wide valley (different from גַּיְא *a ravine*), or plain between mountains (from בקע *to cleave* or *rend*), level (Is. 40^{4}) and broad (as Jos. 11^{17} the בִּקְעָה of Lebanon, *i.e.* Cœle-Syria, the broad sweep between Lebanon and Ḥermon): cf. 11^{11} 34^{3}. —**8.** *A land of wheat, and barley, &c.*] the various products are enumerated, for which the soil of Palestine was principally celebrated, and which contributed to make it an object of envy to its neighbours.—*Oil-olives*] זֵית שֶׁמֶן lit. *the olive of oil, i.e.* the cultivated olive (Tristram, *NHB.* 375, 377) as opposed to the wild olive: cf. 2 K. 18^{32} זֵית יִצְהָר.—**9.** *A land whose stones are iron*] *i.e.* whose stones contain iron.

The hot springs at Tiberias contain iron; and further north, at Ḥasbeyah, "the ground and springs are strongly impregnated with iron" (Burckh. p. 33 f.). Iron-works, and iron-mines, are frequently mentioned in the Lebanon, at Zahle and other places (Seetzen, i. 145, 187–190, 237); and horse-shoes made at Dêr-el-Ḳamar are used throughout Palestine (Schwarz, *Das Heil. Land*, 1852, p. 323); but it seems doubtful whether iron was ever obtained in Canaan itself. Perhaps, however, what is meant is the hard iron-like basalt, a volcanic product, which contains about ⅕ of iron (p. 54), and which was used for various domestic purposes (p. 49): this extends over a large area E. and NE. of the Sea of Tiberias (including the Leja, p. 49), it occurs also about Ṣafed, NW. of the same sea, in parts of Moab (cf. the σιδηροῦν ὄρος of Jos. *BJ.* iv. 8. 2), and here and there W. of Jordan: see Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. 294–300 = *Geogr. of Pal.* (transl.) ii. 241–246; Rob. ii. 388, 409, 411, 416 f. (about Tiberias); and esp. Hull, *Geology and Geography of Pal.* 1886, pp. 93–99, with the geological map at the beginning. (The reff. are partly from Kn.)

And out of whose hills thou mayest dig copper] according to Schwarz (*l.c.*) copper is not found nearer to Palestine than at Aleppo, though he adds that it is *said* to occur in N. Galilee and Lebanon. Ritter, xvii. 1063 (Kn.), mentions traces of former copper-works near Ḥama (Ḥamath). Copper-mines were also formerly worked at Punon (Gn. 32^{41}) in Edom.—**10.** *And thou shalt eat and be full* (6^{11}), *and shalt bless Jehovah, &c.*] it will be Israel's duty to praise God, with a grateful heart,

9. לֹא בְמִסְכֵּנֻת] notice the emph. position in which this idea is placed, immediately after אשר.—מסכנת] only here: מִסְכֵּן *poor* (common in Aram.) is not found till Eccl. 4^{13} $9^{15.16}$; cf. מְסֻכָּן Is. 40^{20}.—הרריה] this plur. is elsewhere only poet. 33^{15} Nu. 23^{7}, &c. (9 times).—**10.** ושׂבעת] G-K. § 49. 3ᶜ. So v.[12].

Digitized by Google

for the abundance of good things which He has provided for it.—**11–17.** The caution lest, elated by such affluence and prosperity, Israel forgets its Benefactor and Deliverer.—**11.** *Beware, &c.*] so 6^{12}.—**14.** *Thine heart be lifted up*] 17^{20}: Hos. 13^{6} שָׂבְעוּ וַיָּרָם לִבָּם.—*Which brought thee forth . . . bondage*] 6^{12}: cf. 13^{6}. The descriptive clauses, v $^{14b-16}$, each introduced by a participle with the art. (as often in II Isaiah, *e.g.* Is. $43^{16.17}$ $44^{27.28}$ 63^{11-13}), are effectively designed to remind the Israelite of the benefits which he had successively received at Jehovah's hands.—**15.** *The great and terrible wilderness*] 1^{19} (with note).—*Fiery serpents and scorpions*] cf. Is. 30^{6} (of the same region); Nu. 21^{6}.—*Out of the rock of flint*] cf. 32^{13}: Ex. 17^{6}.—**16.** *With manna, &c.*] v.$^{3.2b}$.—*To do thee good* (28^{63} 30^{5}) *in thy latter end*] *i.e.* in the later period of Israel's history,—here, of the period of the occupation of Canaan. Israel is represented as an individual (Hos. 11^{1} Jer. 2^{2} Ez. 16 Ps. 129^{1} &c.), whose training in early life has been severe for the purpose of fitting him better for the position which he has to fill in riper years (אחרית as Job 8^{7} 42^{12}).—**18.** But Israel must remember that Jehovah is the author of their prosperity,—though He grants it to them, not for any merit on their part, but in order that He may be faithful to the promises given to the fathers (4^{37} 7^{8}).—*His covenant, &c.*] 4^{31}; cf. 1^{8}.—*As at this day*] 2^{30}.—**19–20.** If Israel neglects the warning, and follows after "other gods," its fate will be that of the nations which

12–17. פֶּן תֹּאכַל וְשָׂבָעְתָּ . . . וְיָשַׁבְתָּ . . . וְרָם לְבָבֶךָ וְשָׁכַחְתָּ . . . (17) וְאָמַרְתָּ בִּלְבָבֶךָ] an example, of a kind not very frequent in Heb., of a long sentence under the government of a single conjunction: cf. Ex. $34^{15f.}$. The principal verbs are those in v.$^{16.17}$, those in v.$^{12f.}$ being subordinate: English idiom (which expresses such distinctions more readily than Hebrew), instead of "Lest thou eat and be full . . ., *and* thine heart be lifted up," has accordingly "Lest, *when* thou hast eaten and art full . . ., *then* thine heart be lifted up." But . . . פֶּן כַּאֲשֶׁר or . . . פֶּן כִּי would in Hebrew be thoroughly unidiomatic.—**14.** המוציאך] the suff., as the art. shows, is an accus. (G-K. § 127 R. 4^{b}): so v.$^{15.16}$ $13^{6.11}$.—**15.** צמאון] Is. 35^{7} Ps. 107^{33}†.—אשר]=*where* (1^{31}).—**16.** ירעון] v.^{3}.—**17.** עצם ידי] cf. Job 30^{21} (in bad sense).—**17.** עשה לי את החיל הזה] Ez. 28^{4} will illustrate both עשה (*to make, achieve, gain*: Gn. 12^{5}) and חיל (*substance, wealth*: Is. 8^{4} *al.*). So v.^{18}. Elsewhere עשה חיל (without the reflexive לְ) means *to make might, i.e.* to exhibit prowess, do valiantly, Nu. 24^{18} 1 S. 14^{48} Ps. 60^{14} $118^{15.16}$.—**18.** וְזָכַרְתָּ] *remember, then* (v.^{5}).—הוא הנתן] on 3^{22}.—**19.** אם שכח תשכח] the inf.

Digitized by Google

Jehovah is now expelling before it (cf. $4^{25f.}$ $6^{14f.}$).—*Go after other gods, &c.*] 6^{14}.—*I testify against you, &c.*] cf. 4^{26}.

IX. 1–X. 11. A warning against self-righteousness. Israel's successes against the Canaanites are to be attributed not to any exceptional virtue or merit of its own, but to the wickedness of those nations (9^{1-6}). Proof, from the history, of Israel's rebellious disposition (9^{7}–10^{11}).—**IX. 1–2.** The formidable character of the inhabitants of Canaan.—**1.** *Hear, O Israel*] 5^{1}.—*Thou art passing over this day*] 2^{18}: cf. 11^{31}.—*Greater and mightier than thyself*] 4^{38} 7^{1} 11^{23} (also with *possess*).—*Cities great . . . 'Anakim*] 1^{28}.—**2.** *Whom thou* (emph.) *knowest* (7^{15}), *and of whom thou* (emph.) *hast heard, &c.*] viz. from the report of the spies, 1^{28} (Nu. 13^{28}).—**3.** Nevertheless, with Jehovah's aid, Israel will be victorious against them: cf. 1^{30} 31^{3}.—*Is he which goeth over before thee*] 31^{3}.—*A devouring fire*] 4^{24}.—*He shall destroy them, and he shall subdue them*] both the pronouns are emphatic,—*he* (and not another). Cf. 7^{21-24}. הכניע (subdue), as Jud. 3^{30} 4^{23} 8^{28} 11^{33} 1 S. 7^{13} 2 S. 8^{1}.—*Quickly*] comp. on 7^{22}.—*As Jehovah hath spoken unto thee*] Ex. $23^{23.\,27.\,31b}$ (cf. 1^{21}).—**4–6.** But it is not for any merit on Israel's part that Jehovah thus gives victory to its hosts: He drives out these nations on account of their wickedness, and that He may be faithful to the promise given to the patriarchs.—**4.** *Say not in thine heart*] cf. 7^{17}.—*Whereas for the wickedness . . . before thee*] the clause is not expressed in 𝕲; and is very probably a gloss borrowed from v.^{5}, and improperly anticipating it (Valeton, vi. 166; Dillm.; Oettli).—**5.** *For the wickedness of these nations*] cf. Gn. 15^{16} Lev. $18^{3.\,24-30}$ 20^{23} Dt. 18^{12} 20^{18} 1 K. 14^{24} 21^{26} 2 K. 16^{3} 17^{8} 21^{2}.—*Is dispossessing them* (מורישם) *from before thee*] Ex. 34^{24} כי אוריש גוים מפניך (JE): so also Dt. 4^{38} 11^{23} Jos. 3^{10} $23^{5.\,9}$ (all D^{2}) Jud. $2^{21.\,23}$ (Deut.); and in the passages of Kings (all Deut.) just quoted.—*That he may establish, &c.*] the

abs. emphasizing the terms of a *condition*, as Ex. 15^{26} 19^{5} 21^{5} $22^{3.\,11}$ Nu. 21^{2} 1 S. 1^{11} 12^{25} 14^{30} $20^{6.\,7.\,9.\,21}$ &c.—עקב] 7^{12}.

IX. 1. לרשת] ירש, with a *personal* object, as $2^{12.\,21.\,22}$ 11^{23} $12^{2.\,29}$ 18^{14} 19^{1} 31^{3}: cf. Nu. 21^{32} Kt. Jud. $11^{23.\,24}$. The obj. is usu. a place.—**3.** אש אכלה] an implicit accus. (G-K. § 118. 5; Dr. § 161. 3).—**4.** הדף] 6^{19}.—מורישם] the ptcp., as 2^{4}.—**5.** הקים את הדבר] lit. to *raise up*, *i.e.* to *maintain*, *confirm*, *fulfil*: so 1 K. 8^{20} 12^{15} *al.*; opp. הִפִּיל *to let fall* 1 S. 3^{19} (cf. נפל Jos. 21^{43}

Digitized by Google

same motive as 7^{8}, cf. 8^{18}.—**6.** Israel has never yielded itself readily to God's will.—*A stiff (hard)-necked people* (קְשֵׁה עֹרֶף)] Ex. 32^{9} $33^{3.\,5}$ 34^{9}† (all from the narrative which the Writer is about to recapitulate): cf. *hard neck* Dt. 31^{27}, *to harden the neck* Dt. 10^{16}, and hence Jer. 7^{26} 17^{23} 19^{15} 2 K. 17^{14} (Deut.) Neh. $9^{16.\,17.\,29}$ (by the side of other reminiscences from Dt.), 2 Ch. 30^{8} 36^{13}. The figure underlying the expression is of course the unyielding neck of an obstinate, intractable animal (cf. Is. 48^{4} וגִיד ברזל ערפך).

IX. 7–X. 11. Proof, from the history, and especially from the episode of the Golden Calf, of Israel's rebellious temper, which, but for Moses' intercession, and Jehovah's forbearance, had cost them their national existence.—The proof is given in the form of a retrospect, similar in general style to c. 1–3, and based like that upon the narrative of JE, of which it is a free reproduction, many passages being repeated *verbatim*, while others are expanded or otherwise varied, in accordance with the Writer's manner, as exemplified in c. 1–3. The following Table will show how the two narratives run parallel to each other (in explanation of the parentheses, see p. 10):—

Dt. 9^{9} (to *nights*)	Ex. $24^{12a.\,18b}$.	Dt. 9^{25}	[Resumption of v.^{18}].
9^{9b}	(Ex. 34^{*8a}).	9^{26}	(Ex. 32^{11b}).
9^{10a}	Ex. 31^{18b}.	9^{27a}	(Ex. 32^{13}).
9^{12}	Ex. 32^{7-8a}.	9^{28}	(Nu. 14^{16}; cf. Ex. 32^{12}).
9^{13}	Ex. 32^{9}.	9^{29b}	(Ex. 32^{11b}).
9^{14b}	Ex. 32^{10b} (cf. Nu. 14^{12b}).	10^{1a}	Ex. 34^{1a}.
9^{15}	Ex. 32^{15}.	10^{1b}	Ex. 34^{2}.
9^{16}	Cf. Ex. 32^{19a}.	10^{1c} (the *ark*)	* * *
9^{17}	Ex. 32^{19b}.	10^{2a}	Ex. 34^{1b}.
9^{18-19}	Ex. 34^{28} (cf. ^{9}).	10^{2b-3a} (the *ark*)	* * *
9^{20}	* * *	10^{3b}	Ex. 34^{4}.
9^{21}	Ex. 32^{20}.	10^{4}	Ex. 34^{28b}.
9^{22}	See Nu. 11^{1-3} Ex. 17^{7} Nu. 11^{4-34}.	$10^{5.\,6-9}$	* * *
9^{23}	[See $1^{19.\,26.\,32}$].	10^{10} (=$9^{18a.\,19b}$)	Cf. Ex. $34^{9f.\,28a}$.
		10^{11}	(Cf. Ex. 33^{1}).

7. *Remember, forget not*] comp. $25^{17.\,19\,end}$.—*Madest wroth*] v.$^{8.\,19.\,22}$: cf. 1^{34}.—*From the day, &c.*] cf. Ex. 15^{24} 17^{2-7} Nu.

1 K. 8^{56} *al.*).—**7.** לְמִן] 4^{32}.—ממרים הייתם] the ptcp. with היה emphasizes the *continuance* of the action: cf. v.$^{22.\,24}$ 31^{27} 2 S. 3^{17} (Dr. § 135. 5; G-K.

11. $14^{2-4. 11-25. 41f.}$ $20^{3a. 5}$ $21^{4f.}$ 25^{1-5}.—*Unto this place*] 1^{31}.—*Been defiant with*] on 1^{26}.—**8.** *And* (in particular) *in Ḥoreb, &c.*] Ex. 32–34.—*Was angered*] v.[20] 1^{37}.—**9.** *When I went up, &c.*] Ex. $24^{12. 18b}$.*—*The tables of the covenant*] v.[11. 15] 1 K. 8^{9} 𝕲 (Deut.). Cf. 4^{13} (see note), $5^{2ff.}$.—*Forty days and forty nights*] Ex. 24^{18b}.*—*I neither ate bread nor drank water*] this clause agrees with Ex. 34^{28}, which relates, however, to a different occasion, viz. Moses' *third* ascent of the mountain. Unless it may be supposed that such a clause, describing Moses' fasting, once stood in E after Ex. 24^{18b}, and was still read there by the author of Dt. (being afterwards omitted when the narrative of E was combined with that of P), it will be another example of the peculiarity which was several times referred to in the notes on c. 1–3, and which will meet us again in the retrospect here, an expression, viz., used in the description of one incident, or occasion, in Ex., being applied somewhat singularly in the description of another in Dt.—**10.** *Tables of stone, written with the finger of God*] exactly as Ex. 31^{18b} (E).—*Spake with you in the mount out of the midst of the fire*] 5^{4} 10^{4}.—*In the day of the assembly*] (הקהל)] 10^{4} 18^{16}: comp. the verb in 4^{10}. This designation of the day on which the law was given at Ḥoreb is peculiar to Dt.—**11.** The *v.* repeats v.[10a], with the additional statement that it was at the end of the 40 days that the tables were given to Moses.

12 *And Jehovah* said *unto* me, *saying*, Arise, *get thee down* quickly from here; *for thy people, which thou hast* brought forth *out of Egypt, hath done corruptly: they are quickly turned aside out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten image.*	Ex. 32^{7} And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Go, get thee down; for thy people, which thou hast brought up out of Egypt, hath done corruptly: 8 they are quickly turned aside out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten image; they have

§ 116. 5 R.[2]—עִם] *i.e.* in dealing with; so v.[24] 31^{27}: cf. הֵיטִיב עִם Nu. 11^{32} *al.*; עשה עם Ps. 86^{17} *al.*—**9.** בעלתי . . . ואשב] either (*a*) as G-K. § 114. 3, Dr. § 117, defining the occasion of v.[8]; or (*b*) as G-K. § 111. 1, Dr. § 127 β,—prob. the latter (so RV.): cf. Gn. 22^{4} 27^{34} Is. 6^{1} &c.—לוחות האבנים] 4^{13}.—לחם וג'] a circumst. clause (Dr. § 163).

* Ex. $24^{12-14. 18b}$ (from *and he went up*) belong closely to Ex. 31^{18b} "[And J. gave him] the tables of stone," &c., forming a continuous narrative of E: the intermediate passages, Ex. 24^{15-18a} 31^{18a} (to *testimony*) belong to P, and are not referred to in Dt.

Digitized by Google

	bowed down to it, and sacrificed to it, and have said, These be thy gods, &c.
13 *And Jehovah said unto* me, saying, *I have seen this people, and behold it is a stiff-necked people.*	9 And Jehovah said unto Moses, I have seen this people, and behold it is a stiff-necked people.
14 Desist from me (הרף ממני), *that I may* destroy *them*, and blot out their name from under heaven; *and I will make thee into a nation* mightier and larger (רב) than it. 15 *And* I *turned, and came down from the mount*, and the mount burned with fire; *and the two tables* of the covenant were on my two *hands*.	10 And now, let me alone (הניחה לי), that mine anger may kindle against them, and that I may consume them; and I will make thee into a great (גדול) nation. . . . . 15 And Moses turned, and came down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand. . . . .
17 And I took hold of the two tables, *and* I *flung* them *from* on my two *hands, and* I *brake them* before your eyes.	19b And Moses' anger kindled; and he flung the tables *from* his hand, and he brake them under the mount.
21 *And* your sin, *which* ye *had made*, even *the calf*, I *took, and* I *burnt it with fire, and* beat it in pieces, *grinding* it well, *until it was crushed fine* into dust; and I cast its dust into the stream (wādy) that descended out of the mount.	20 And he took the calf which they had made, and he burnt it with fire, and he ground it, until it was crushed fine ; and he strewed it upon the water, and made the children of Israel drink of it.

The variations will be apparent from the synopsis: as in other cases, they generally exhibit the characteristic style of D.—**14.** *Destroy* (השמיד) v.$^{8. 19. 20. 25}$: see on 1^{27} (phil. n.).—*Blot out, &c.*] $29^{19(20)}$; also 7^{24} 25^{19} (Ex. 17^{14}).—*Mightier and larger* (רב) *than it*] Nu. 14^{12} "And I will make thee into a nation greater (גדול) and mightier than it": cf. c. 7^{1} ("nations larger and mightier than thou").—**15.** *And the mount, &c.*] as 4^{11} $5^{20(23)}$.—*Of the covenant*] v.^{9}.—Ex. 32^{11-14}, describing Moses' *first* intercession for the people while he was still on the mount, and Jehovah's consequent repentance, it will be seen, is passed over in Dt.—**16.** As Moses came down, he perceived what Israel had done: substantially, but not verbally, as Ex. 32^{19a}, "ye had turned aside," &c. being repeated from v.^{12}.—**17.** *Before your eyes*] one of D's phrases (on 1^{30}).—**18–20.** Moses'

12. עשו להם] on 1^{13}.—**14.** הרף ממני] lit. "*relax, slacken* (sc. thy hand) *from me*": Jud. 11^{37} הַרְפֵּה ממני, 1 S. 11^{3} הֶרֶף לָנוּ (*for us*,—the dat. commodi), 1 S. 15^{16} הרף alone, Ps. 46^{11} הרפו.—**17.** מֵעַל שתי ידי] the correlative of על שתי ידי v.^{15}. Cf. Lev. 8^{28} מֵעַל כפיכם (v.^{27} עַל).

Digitized by Google

intercession: for 40 days he fell down fasting before God, on behalf of the people and Aaron, and obtained their forgiveness. The reference is not, as might appear at first sight, to Ex. 32^{31-33}, but to the same 40 days mentioned in 10^{10} (comp. esp. 10^{10a} with 9^{18a}, and 10^{10b} with 9^{19b}), *i.e.* with the *second* period of 40 days spent by Moses on the mount (Ex. 34^{4-28}), when, according to Ex. 34^{9}, he also interceded for the people. No doubt this intercession is mentioned here, in anticipation of its true chronological position (for v.^{21} corresponds to Ex. 32^{20}), on account of its significance in the argument: it signally illustrated how much the people owed to the merciful forbearance of Jehovah.—**18.** *As at the first*] so 10^{10}. The reference can be only to the forty days mentioned in 9^{9}. The comparison (unless *fell down* be used of fasting and humiliation generally) must relate to the period of time only.—*That which was evil, &c.*] on 6^{18}.—*To vex him* (להכעיסו)] viz. by requiting Him with ingratitude. Not "to provoke him *to anger*"; see on 4^{25}. —**19.** *For I was in dread* (יגרתי)] a rare word: 28^{60} Job 3^{25} 9^{28} Ps. 119^{39}.—*That time also*] the other occasions, implicitly alluded to, on which Jehovah listened to Moses' intercession may (as the *whole* period of the 40 years is in the Writer's mind, v.$^{7.\ 22f.}$, and the occasion of the Golden Calf seems to be specially dwelt upon as being the gravest of all) be subsequent ones, as Nu. 11^{2} $12^{13f.}$ 14^{13-20} 21^{7-9}: Ex. 15^{25} $17^{4f.}$ are instances of response to petitions for help, not to *intercessory* prayer.—**20.** *And I interceded for Aaron also at that time*] the intercession for Aaron is not mentioned in Ex.—**21.** See the synopsis above. This, of course, according to Ex., was before the intercession of v.$^{18-20}$; and the Heb. idiom employed (see below) perfectly admits this. —*The stream that descended, &c.*] cf. (of Jebel Mûsa) *Ordnance Survey of Sinai* (1869), pp. 113, 115, 148; (of Serbal) p. 144, and Ebers, *Gosen*, p. 388.—**22–23.** Other instances of Israel's disobedience.—**22.** *Tab'ērah*] Nu. 11^{1-3}.—*Massah*] 6^{16} Ex. 17^{2-7}. —*Ḳibroth-hatta'ăvah*] Nu. 11^{4-34}.—**23.** *Ḳadesh-barnea'*] $1^{19b.\ 21}$

18. התנפל] v.$^{25.\ 25}$ Ezr. 10^{1}; differently, Gn. 43^{18}†.—**21.** ו . . . לקחתי] not וָאקח; see on 10^{10}.—טחון] inf. abs., as 3^{6}.—היטב] "doing it well" = *thoroughly* (the inf. abs. used adverbially: G-K. § 113. 2 R.^{2}): so 13^{15} 17^{4} 19^{18} 27^{8}. Elsewhere, in this application, only 2 K. 11^{18}.—**22.** מקציפים הייתם] *ye were making* wroth (on v.^{7}).—**23.** ובשלח . . . ותמרו] constr. as v.^{9} (*b*).

Digitized by Google

(עֲלֵה רֵשׁ), [20] ("defied Jehovah's mouth"), [32] ("believed him not").—**24.** The indictment of v.[7], repeated in terms of keener reproach ("from the day that I knew you"). For "I," Sam. 𝔊 have "he" (דַּעְתּוֹ for דַּעְתִּי), *i.e.* Jehovah (Hos. 13[5]).

25–29. The Writer reverts here to the occasion mentioned v.[18] (*i.e.* Ex. 34[9. 28a]), for the purpose of emphasizing (in accordance with the general design of the retrospect) the indebtedness of Israel to Moses' intercession. It is remarkable however that the terms of the intercession, as here quoted, do not agree with those of Ex. 34[9], but include many reminiscences of the *earlier* intercession in Ex. 32[11-13] (as also some from Nu. 14[16]): comp. p. 10. (Vv.[25-29] cannot refer actually to Ex. 32[11-13], because the intercession there recorded was made *before* Moses' first descent from the mount (see v.[15] = Dt. 9[15]), whereas v.[25], in virtue of the terms used, points back to v.[18], which clearly narrates what took place *after* it, and is parallel with Ex. 34[9. 28a].)—**25.** *The forty days and the forty nights, which I fell down*] v.[18]: for the form of sentence, cf. 1[46] 29[15 (16)].—*That he would destroy you*] v.[14]. **26–29.** Moses' intercession.—**26.** *O Lord Jehovah*] 3[24].—*Which thou hast brought forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand*] Ex. 32[11b] "which thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt with great power, and with a mighty hand." The preceding clause, "which thou hast redeemed through thy greatness," contains two Deut. expressions; see on 3[24] 7[8].—**27.** *Remember thy servants, Abraham, &c.*] cf. Ex. 32[13].—**28.** *Lest the land whence thou broughtest us out say, From Jehovah's not being able to bring them into the land which he promised to them, and from his hating them, he hath brought them out to put them to death* (להמיתם) *in the wilderness*] based on Ex. 32[12] ("Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, saying,

25. את ארבעים היום] את, marking duration of time, is very rare (Ex. 13[7] Lev. 25[22]). היום, הלילה (with the art.), because "*the* 40 days" are intended: so Jud. 17[2] אלף ומאה הכסף. 1 K. 11[31] עשרה השבטים "*the* ten tribes," &c.—**27.** זכר לְ] so Ex. 32[13]. Otherwise זכר ל is rare (Jer. 31[34] Ps. 25[7] 136[23] 2 Ch. 6[42]).—פנה אל] *turn to*, i.e. *regard*, usu. in a favourable sense, as Lev. 26[9] 1 K. 8[28].—קְשִׁי] not elsewhere.—**28.** פן יאמרו הארץ] the plur. κατὰ σύνεσιν, as 2 S. 15[23]: so with ארץ = *earth*, Gn. 41[57] 1 S. 17[46], and in late Psalms, as 66[1. 4] 96[1. 9] 100[1]. But (as Di. remarks) Sam. has עם הארץ; and 𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙 express יושבי הארץ.—מבלי] lit. *from want of*, in the original passage Nu. 14[16] מבלתי: cf. 28[55] (see note); also Is. 5[13] Hos. 4[6] Ez. 34[5].—יְכֹלֶת] Nu. 14[16]†.

Digitized by Google

In mischief did he bring them forth, to slay (להרג) them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth"), with reminiscences of Nu. 14^{16} ("From Jehovah's not being able to bring this people into the land which he sware unto them, therefore he hath slaughtered them (וישחטם) in the wilderness").—**29.** *Thy people and thy inheritance*] 1 K. 8^{51} (Deut.); cf. c. 4^{20b}.—*Which thou broughtest forth, &c.*] Ex. 32^{11}.

X. 1–5. Moses narrates how, at Jehovah's direction, he hewed out two other tables of stone, like the first, and prepared an ark of acacia-wood in which to deposit them; Jehovah having rewritten upon these tables the ten commandments, they were placed by Moses in the ark, or chest, prepared for their reception. The intention of this part of the retrospect is doubtless to show how the people were finally restored completely to Jehovah's favour; the rewriting of the ten commandments, on which the "covenant" was based (9^9), and the formal order for their permanent preservation, sealed, as it were, Israel's forgiveness, and was an assurance that the breach between Jehovah and His people was healed.

1 At that time *Jehovah said unto* me, *Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first*, and *come up* unto *me* to *the mount*, and make thee an ark of wood; 2 that I may *write upon the tables the words that were on the first tables, which thou brakest*, and thou shalt put them in the ark. 3 And I made an ark of acacia-wood;	Ex. 34^1 And Jehovah said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first; and I will write upon the tables the words that were on the first tables, which thou brakest. 2 And be ready by the morning, and thou shalt come up in the morning into mount Sinai, and present thyself there unto me on the top of the mount.
and I *hewed two tables of stone like unto the first*,	4 And he hewed two tables of stone like unto the first;
and I *went up* to the *mount*;	and Moses rose up early in the morning, and he went up into mount Sinai, as Jehovah commanded him,
and the *two tables* were *in* my *hand*.	and took in his hand two tables of stone.

It is evident that v.$^{1-3}$ is based upon Ex. $34^{1.2.4}$. There is only one material difference between the two accounts, but it is an important one: in Ex. 34^{1-4} there is no mention of the *ark*, which according to Dt. Moses made at this time for the

Digitized by Google

reception of the two tables, and in which (v.^{5}) he placed them after coming down from the mount. This difference between Dt. and Ex. does not admit of reconciliation. In Ex. instructions respecting the ark are given in 25^{10-21}; and Beẓalel, having been commissioned to execute the work of the sanctuary ($31^{1ff.}$ 35^{30}–36^{1}), makes the ark, 37^{1-9}. There is of course no difficulty in supposing that Moses may have been described as making himself what was in fact made, under his direction, by Beẓalel: but in Dt. Moses is instructed to make, and actually does make, the ark of acacia-wood, *before* ascending the mount the third time to receive the tables of stone; whereas in Ex. the command to make the ark is both given to Beẓalel, and executed by him, *after* Moses' return from the mountain ($35^{30ff.}$ 36^{2} 37^{1}). Ex. 25–31 and 34^{29}–40^{38}, however, belong to P, while Ex. 32^{1}–34^{28} belong to JE. The consistency with which the retrospects of Dt. are based upon JE's narrative in Ex. Nu., renders it highly probable that the text of Ex. 34^{1-5} once told how Moses made the ark of acacia-wood, and deposited the tables in it, agreeably with Dt. $10^{1b. 2b-3a. 5}$; but that when JE was combined (after the composition of Dt.) with P, the passages containing these statements were omitted by the compiler, as inconsistent with the more detailed particulars, which he preferred, contained in the narrative of P (Ex. 25–31; 34^{29}–40^{38}). Comp. above, on 1^{22} 3^{27}.—**4.** *And he wrote, &c.*] cf. Ex. 34^{28b},—at least, as understood by the author of Ex. 34 in its present form (cf. v.$^{1. 4}$; and see *ad loc.*).—*In the mount, &c.*] exactly as 9^{10}.—**5.** *And I turned, &c.*] as 9^{15} (after the *first* sojourn in the mount).—*And I put, &c.*] see on v.$^{1-3}$.—*And there they are*] cf. 1 K. 8^{8b}.—*Commanded me*] v.^{3}.

6–7. A fragment of an itinerary, narrating the journeyings of the Israelites from Beēroth Benē-ja'aḳan to Mosērah (where Aaron died), Gudgodah, and Joṭbathah.—The passage occasions difficulty. It interrupts the discourse of Moses (the 3rd person being used instead of the 2nd, as uniformly elsewhere in the retrospects); it interrupts the chronology (relating the death of Aaron, which—see Nu. $20^{8. 10}$ $20^{22ff.}$ (both P)—cannot have taken place till long after the sojourn at Ḥoreb); and it disagrees with at least P's account of the journeyings of the

Digitized by Google

Israelites, contained in Nu. 33. In Nu. 33 there occur four names differing so slightly that it cannot be doubted that they are the same, viz. v.[30] Mosēroth (pl. of Mosērah), v.[31] Benē-ja'aḳan, v.[32] Ḥor-hag-Gidgad ("the Hollow of Gidgad"), v.[33] Joṭbathah (followed, v.[34] by 'Abronah, v.[35] 'Eẓion-Geber, v.[36] the Wilderness of Ẓin (צִין), or Ḳadesh, v.[37] Mount Hor, where Aaron dies, v.[41] Ẓalmonah, &c.). The order is, however, different; and Aaron dies on Mount Hor (cf. Nu. 20^{22-29} P), not at Mosērah. It is most in accordance with other phenomena presented by the Pent. to suppose that this difference between the two itineraries is due to their expressing divergent traditions respecting the order of the stations passed by the Israelites.

By Keil and other harmonists the assumption usually made is that Dt. 10^{6-7} is parallel, not with Nu. 33^{31-33} but with Nu. 33^{37}: the Israelites, it is supposed, towards the close of their wanderings, journeying Southwards, passed successively (Nu. 33^{31-35}) Mosēroth, Benē-ja'aḳan, Ḥor-hag-Gidgad, Joṭbathah, 'Abronah, and 'Eẓion-Geber (at the N. end of the Gulf of 'Aḳabah), hence, turning back, they revisit Ḳadesh (Nu. 33^{36}), without making any formal stoppage on the route, after which, retracing their steps Southwards (Nu. $33^{37 \cdot 41}$), in order to accomplish the journey round the S. border of Edom, they pass some of the same stations as before, though not in the same order (Beēroth Benē-ja'akan, Mosērah, Gudgodah, Joṭbathah), their second visits to the same spots not being mentioned in the itinerary in Nu. 33, and being only recorded in Dt. 10^{6-7}; the variation as regards the place of Aaron's death is further explained by the assumption (which in our entire ignorance of the actual position of Mosērah may not be illegitimate) that Mosērah was in the immediate neighbourhood of Mount Hor, perhaps the desert at its foot. The explanation, though formally possible, is artificial; and the reason assigned for the omission in Numbers of the four stations in Dt., viz. because their names had been given before, seems a very insufficient one. The discrepancy is diminished, but not removed, by the conjecture of Ewald, *Gesch.* ii. 285 (ET. ii. 201), that in Nu. 33, v.[36b-41a] has been transposed from its original position, and that it once stood after v.[30a]. If this conjecture be correct, the original order of the stations will have been Wilderness of Ẓin (Ḳadesh), Mount Hor, Mosēroth, Benē-ja'aḳan, Ḥor-hag-Gidgad, Joṭbathah, 'Abronah, 'Eẓion-Geber, Ẓalmonah, &c.: Mosērah will now be actually the next station to Mount Hor; and 'Eẓion-Geber (see Dt. 2^{8}) will come in a more natural place, 4 stages before the border of Moab is reached (v.[44]), instead of being followed by the long march back across the desert to Ḳadesh (with no mention of any intermediate stations): the variations in the order of Benē-ja'akan and Mosērah, and of Gudgodah and Joṭbathah, remain, however, still as before.

The *source* of the itinerary in Dt. is probably E. The discrepancy, just noticed, is conclusive against its being borrowed from P; moreover

Digitized by Google

it differs in form from the stereotyped formula of P ("And they journeyed from . . ., and pitched in . . .": Nu. $21^{10.11}$, Nu. 33 *passim*), but resembles that of E (cf. Nu. $21^{12.13.16.18b-20}$): the note in v.[6b], also, is analogous (Bacon) to that of E in Jos. 24^{33}.

The purport of the notice remains to be considered. By some (Hengstenberg, Keil), its aim has been supposed to be to show that Aaron was not only forgiven at Moses' intercession, but was even honoured by the priesthood being confirmed to his descendants. It is true, as has been already observed, that the general design of the retrospect in c. 9–10 is to illustrate the grace of Jehovah in bestowing anew upon His disobedient people the tokens of His favour; but it is difficult to think that, had such been the aim of the present notice, it would have been expressed so indirectly: Aaron's own institution to the priesthood, which would be the important point, is passed over in silence. If it forms an integral part of the narrative (so Graf, *Gesch. B.* 112, Kayser, p. 131, Kuen. *Th. T.* 1881, 201 f., Delitzsch, *ZKWL.* 1880, 565), it cannot be reasonably explained, except as introductory to v.[8f.], and as intended to specify the occasion, viz. the sojourn at Joṭbathah or at least the period of Aaron's death, at which the tribe of Levi were set apart for sacred purposes. But the introduction here of a piece of the itinerary, belonging to almost the *close* of the 40 years' wanderings, while the people, both before and after (v.[10-11]), are represented as still at Ḥoreb, and the late period in the 40 years, which in opposition to the other sources it would assign for the consecration of the tribe of Levi, constitute serious objections to this view.

The interruption, both in the chronology and in the discourse of Moses, must be admitted to make it probable that the notice is no original part of the text of Dt., but either a subsequent insertion (Wellh. *Hist.* 371; Reuss, *La Bible*, ii. 297 (with v.[8f.]); Cornill, *Einl.* § 9. 8; Dillm.), introduced from a part of E, which still survived independently, perhaps with the view of illustrating (v.[6b]) the manner in which priestly duties (v.[8f.]) were provided for after Aaron's death; or (Bacon, *Triple Tradition*, 207 f., 257 f., 343 f.) a fragment of E's original narrative of Israel's final journeyings, and of Moses' final discourse, which retained its position after the latter (as a whole) was replaced by our present Dt.—*Bĕērōth Bĕnē-ja'aḳan*] *i.e.* the "Wells of the children of Ja'aḳan." The site is unknown: but, as Gn. 36^{27} mentions 'Aḳan as the name of a Ḥorite family or clan, for which 1 Ch. 1^{42} has Ja'aḳan (and 𝔊 in Gen. Ιουκαμ), it is not improbable that the two are to be identified, in which case the site of the "wells" referred to would be in or near the 'Arábah (1^1), not far from Edom. The sites of the other three places named are also unknown: the addition

Digitized by Google

"a land of streams (wādys) of water" to Joṭbathah would seem to characterize it as some specially fertile spot in one of Wadys leading down into the ʿArábah. The identification of Gudgodah with the Wady Ghuḍāghiḍ (غضاغض), which runs down from the Tih plateau (p. 20) into the Wady Jerāfeh, and so into the ʿArábah, nearly opposite to Petra (Rob. i. 181), is not probable on phonetic grounds: for غ does not correspond to the Heb. ג, nor ض to ד.—*And Eleʿazar his son was priest in his stead*] Eleʿazar is mentioned frequently in P (Ex. 6^{23} Nu. 20^{25-28} $32^{1.28}$ Jos. 14^{1} &c.), but not elsewhere in JE, except Jos. 24^{33} (E). The passage is important, as showing that in the tradition of JE, not less than in P, Aaron was the founder of a hereditary priesthood.

8–9. Separation of the tribe of Levi for the exercise of priestly functions.—As the contents and phraseology show (see the references, and note "thy God" in v.[9]), these two verses are a genuine continuation of the discourse of Moses, which was interrupted by v.[6-7].—**8.** *At that time*] if v.[6-7] be an original part of the text of Dt., the reference must be to the period indicated in these verses, *i.e.* to the period immediately following the death of Aaron, towards the close of the 40 years' wanderings. If, on the other hand, v.[6-7] be a later addition, the words will refer, of course, to the occasion described in v.[1-5], during the sojourn at Ḥoreb. In the existing Pent. the institution of the priesthood is narrated in Ex. 28–29, Lev. 8 (both P), and the Levites (the inferior members of the tribe, as distinguished from the priests) are consecrated to their duties in Nu. $3^{5ff.}$ (also P): but the expression *at that time* is much more significant, if the view of Dillmann (*Ex.-Lev.* p. 342) and others be accepted, that JE's narrative in Ex. 32–34 contained originally an account of the consecration of the tribe of Levi—in connexion, presumably, with their display of zeal on Jehovah's behalf, narrated in Ex. 32^{26-29}—to which reference is here made, but which the compiler of Exodus did not deem it necessary to retain by the side of the more detailed particulars of P (Ex. 28–29, Lev. 8; Nu.

X. 8. הבדיל] 4^{41} $19^{2.7}$ 29^{20} (לרעה).—הלוי] collect. = *the Levites* (on $3^{9.13}$).

Digitized by Google

3).—*To bear the ark of Jehovah's covenant, to stand before Jehovah to minister to him, and to bless in his name unto this day*] three principal functions of the tribe of Levi, all, properly speaking, *priestly* ones, are described in these words. (1) *To bear the ark.* In P (Nu. 3^{31} 4^{15}) the duty of carrying the ark is assigned to the "Levites," in the narrower sense of the word (as distinguished from the priests), in particular to the family of the Ḳohathites; and the same view is expressed in the Chronicles (1 Ch. $15^{2.15.26}$ &c.). But in Dt., as in other earlier books, this is consistently represented as the duty of the *priests.* Dt. 31^{9} (on v.^{25} see note) Jos. 8^{33} "the priests the Levites," *i.e.* the Levitical priests (see on 18^{1}), receive the title "bearers of the ark of Jehovah's covenant"; and in Jos. $3^{3ff.}$ $6^{6.12}$ 1 K. $8^{3.6}$ the priests are represented as bearing it: see also 1 K. 2^{26}.* (In 2 Ch. 5^{4}, which corresponds to 1 K. 8^{3}, "Levites" is substituted for "priests," to bring the passage into conformity with later usage: 2 Ch. 5^{5} has "the priests the Levites," where 1 K. 8^{4} has "the priests and the Levites," preserving probably the original reading of Kings: 2 Ch. 5^{7} (= 1 K. 8^{6}) "priests" has been permitted to remain.)—*The ark of Jehovah's covenant*] *i.e.* the ark containing the Decalogue, the embodiment of Jehovah's covenant (on 4^{13}). The designation is one which gives prominence to one of the leading Deuteronomic ideas (4^{13}); and it is accordingly frequently used by writers belonging to the Deuteronomic school, or influenced by its phraseology.

It occurs besides $31^{9.25.26}$ Jos. $3^{3.14.17}$ $4^{7.18}$ 6^{8} 8^{33}, and without "of Jehovah" (ארון הברית) $3^{6.8}$ (cf.^{11}) 4^{9} 6^{6} (mostly Deut. passages); also (sometimes with *God* for *Jehovah*) Nu. 10^{33} 14^{44} (both JE), Jud. 20^{27} (in an explanatory gloss) 1 S. $4^{3.4.4.5}$ 2 S. 15^{24a} 1 K. 3^{15} 6^{19} $8^{1.6}$ (= 2 Ch. $5^{2.7}$) Jer. 3^{16} 1 Ch. $15^{25.26.28.29}$ $16^{6.37}$ 17^{1} 22^{19} $28^{2.18}$. The usual expression in the earlier hist. books is, however, simply "the ark of Jehovah (*or* of God)": as Jos. 3^{13} $4^{5.11}$ 6 $^{6.7.11-13}$ 7^{6} 1 S. 3^{3} $4^{6.11.17-22}$, c. 5–6 *passim*, 7^{1} (*bis*), 2 S. 6 *passim*, $15^{24b.25.29}$. The fuller title "ark of the covenant of Jehovah," even if, in view of Nu. 10^{33} 14^{44}, it be too much to maintain that it actually originated with Dt., certainly acquired increased currency through its influence (cf. p. 68); and it is probable that there are passages in the Massoretic text in which the expression originally used has been sub-

* Which shows that the part taken by the "Levites" in 2 S. 15^{24} (unless meant in D's sense: cf. on 18^{8}) must have been either a subordinate one (cf. v.$^{25.29}$), or exceptional. (Baudissin, *Priesterthum*, 209, reads *ephod.*)

Digitized by Google

sequently expanded by the addition of "the covenant of": thus it is plain that ברית did not stand in 𝔊's text of 1 S. 4^{3-5}; and a comparison of 1 Ch. $15^{25.26.28.29}$ with 2 S. $6^{12.13.15.16}$, and of 1 Ch. 17^1 with 2 S. 7^2 sufficiently shows what the tendency of a later age was. In Jos. 3^{14-17} the extraordinary syntax (הארון with the art. in the *st. c.*) makes it all but certain that the original text had simply *the ark* (as 3^{15} 4^{10}): Jos. 3^{11} הברית (see Dillm.) appears to have usurped the place of an original יהוה (as v.[13]). 1 K. 3^{15} 6^{19} $8^{1.6}$ (cf. [21]) the expression may well be due to the Deut. compiler of Kings. See further the *ZATW.* 1891, p. 114 ff.

(2) *To stand before Jehovah, to minister unto him* (cf. 18^5 "to stand to minister in Jehovah's name"). *To stand before* (1^{38}) is a Heb. idiom meaning *to wait upon, to serve* (1 K. 10^8 of Solomon's courtiers, 12^8 Jer. 52^{12}; 1 K. 17^1 18^{15} 2 K. 3^{14} 5^{16} of Elijah and Elisha, as the servants of God), and is used distinctively of the *priest*, as God's minister, Dt. 17^{12} 18^7 (see note) Jud. 20^{28} Ez. 44^{15} 2 Ch. 29^{11} (cf. v.[4.16] "priests").

The Levites, as distinguished from the priests, "stand before" the congregation, *i.e.* perform menial offices for the worshippers, Nu. 16^9 (P) Ez. 44^{11b}. *To minister* (שֵׁרֵת) is a less distinctive term, being used not only of priests, but also of Levites (Nu. 8^{26}) and other subordinate attendants, as 1 S. $2^{11.18}$ 3^1 (of Samuel): at the same time, "to minister *to Jehovah*" is an expression used regularly of priests (21^5 Ez. 40^{46} 43^{19} $44^{15.16}$ 45^4 Joel $1^{9.13}$ 2^{17} 1 Ch. 23^{13} 2 Ch. 13^{10} 29^{11}: cf. *before J.* Dt. 17^{12}, *in the name of J.* $18^{5.7}$); the Levites are said rather "to minister *to the priests*" (Nu. 3^6 18^2, cf. 2 Ch. 8^{14}), or *to the people* (Nu. 16^9 Ez. 44^{11b}), *i.e.* to discharge menial services for them (see *e.g.* 1 Ch. $9^{27-29.31-2}$; 2 Ch. 35^{11}).

(3) *To bless in his name*: so (of priests) 21^5, and (repeated from the present passage, but limited expressly to the descendants of Aaron) 1 Ch. 23^{13},—a priestly duty, Nu. 6^{23} Lev. 9^{22}, though performed sometimes, on solemn occasions, by kings (2 S. 6^{18}; cf. 1 K. $8^{14.55}$). A fourth duty of the priestly tribe, that of burning incense, is mentioned 33^{10} (*v.* note). See more fully, on the position assigned in Dt. to the tribe of Levi, the notes on 18^{1-8}.—*Unto this day*] 2^{22}.—**9.** *Therefore Levi hath no portion nor inheritance with his brethren: Jehovah is his inheritance*] so 12^{12b} $14^{27b.29}$ 18^1 (no portion, &c.), cf. Jos. $13^{14.33}$ 18^7 (all D^2); Dt. 18^2 Jos. $13^{14.33}$ (Jehovah his inheritance): by the latter expression is meant that the inheritance by which the tribe of Levi was maintained was its share in the sacred dues and other offerings made to Jehovah by the people (cf. on 18^{2-4}).—*As Jehovah thy God spake unto him*] this is not recorded in our present Pent.: Nu. 18^{20} (P), which is

Digitized by Google

usually quoted, cannot be referred to, for there the promise is made expressly to the *priests* (Aaron) alone, as distinguished from the Levites (v.[21-24]), whose "inheritance" is specified separately, v.[24]; here it is given to the whole tribe, without distinction. The words may well have been contained in a part of JE—probably the same (see on v.[8]) that narrated the consecration of the tribe of Levi—which was still read by the author of Dt., but not retained by the compiler, when JE was combined with P.

10–11. Conclusion of the narrative of Moses' intercession for the people. Jehovah finally gave still more substantial proof of His complete forgiveness of the nation, by bidding Moses arise, and conduct Israel to the land which He had promised to the patriarchs.—**10.** *And I stayed in the mount, as at the first time, forty days and forty nights*] the verse (see below) does not describe the sequel of v.[5], but something contemporaneous with the transactions of which v.[5] narrates the close: it repeats in fact what had been stated before in 9^{18} (cf. 9^{25}), emphasizing again the earnestness of Moses' intercession, and the success which attended it, with the view of showing that the present existence of the nation was due to Jehovah's grace.—*Hearkened unto me that time also*] repeated from 9^{19}: cf. 9^{25-29}.—**11.** *Arise, go to journey, &c.*] varied from Ex. 33^{1} (though the occasion is not the same).

12–22. Such, then, having been Jehovah's gracious dealings with His people, gratitude, not less than awe, should prompt Israel to yield ready and loving obedience to His holy will.—**12.** *And, now*] introducing, as 4^{1}, the practical inference to be deduced from the preceding retrospect.—*What is Jehovah thy God asking of thee, &c.?*] no arduous or complex task is laid upon Israel: only obedience, which though it may be difficult in view of the sinful propensities of human nature, nevertheless involves the observance of no intricate or burden-

10. ואנכי עמדתי] permitting (as וָאֶעֱמֹד would not have done) a reference to an occasion *prior* to v.[5] (Dr. § 76 *Obs.*).—**11.** למסע] *for journeying*,—one of the rare instances in Heb. of a subst. formed with מ having (as in certain cases in Aram. and Arabic) the force of an inf.: cf. Nu. 10^{2} וּלְמַסַּע את המחנות (with trans. force), *ib.* למקרא העדה, Gen. 30^{37} מַחְשֹׂף, and כמהפכת אלהים את סדם Am. 4^{11} *al.* (cf. Ew. § 239[a]; G-K. § 45. 1[e] 115. 1 R.[3]).—**12.** שאל מעמך] Ex. 22^{13} 1 S. $1^{17.27}$.

Digitized by Google

some rules, and should be facilitated in the case of Israel by the recollection of Jehovah's gracious assistance and presence in its midst. Comp. Mic. 6^{8}.—*But to fear Jehovah thy God, &c.*] as in 6^{13}, the foundation of the religious temper is the *fear* of God; this brings with it a natural disposition to *walk in all his ways* (8^{6}), and ends with the devotion of the entire being to His *love* and *service* (see, on the expressions used, $6^{5.\,13}$).—**13.** *To keep, &c.*] 7^{11}.—*For good to thee*] this is the ultimate scope of the duties imposed by Jehovah upon Israel. So 6^{24}; cf. $5^{30\,(33)}$.—**14–15.** The *fear* of God should be promoted by the thought that He is the Sovereign of heaven and earth; the *love* of Him by the reflection that this august, all-sufficient Being has nevertheless, of His own free love, chosen first the patriarchs and afterwards their descendants, for the purpose of manifesting Himself to them.—*The heaven of heavens*] *i.e.* the highest heavens; so (a reminiscence from this passage) 1 K. 8^{27} (= 2 Ch. 6^{18}) 2 Ch. 2^{5} Neh. 9^{6} Ps. 68^{34} 148^{4}†.—**15.** *Set his love* (חשק)] 7^{7}.—*Chose their seed after them, &c.*] $7^{7.\,6b}$.—*As at this day*] 2^{30}.—**16.** Let Israel therefore exert itself to acquire an open and receptive heart, and yield itself cheerfully to the guidance of its God.—*Circumcise, then, the foreskin of your heart*] 30^{6}; and similarly Jer. 4^{4}: cf. *uncircumcised* (עָרֵל), of the heart, Lev. 26^{41} Jer. 9^{25} Ez. $44^{7.\,9}$. An uncircumcised heart is one which is, as it were, closed in, and so impervious to good influences and good impressions, just as an uncircumcised ear (Jer. 6^{10}) is an ear which, from the same cause, hears imperfectly, and uncircumcised lips (cf. Ex. $6^{12.\,30}$) are lips which open and speak with difficulty. The Israelite's heart is not to be unreceptive of godlike affections, just as he is not to be any longer (see $9^{6.\,13.\,27}$) stiff-necked, or unamenable to guidance. **17–19.** The majesty, and awful justice, of Jehovah should constitute further motives to obedience.—**17.** Titles are accumulated, for the purpose of expressing the absolute sovereignty and supremacy of Jehovah.—*God of gods, and Lord of lords*] hence Ps. $136^{2.\,3}$; cf. Dan. 2^{47}.—*The great, the mighty, and the terrible*] hence Neh. 9^{32}. *Mighty* (גִּבּוֹר)

13. לטוב לך] 6^{24}.—**14.** שמי השמים] G-K. § 133. 3 R.[2]—**17.** הוא] 3^{22}.—אדני] the "plur. of majesty," as Gn. 42^{30} (G-K. § 124. 1 R.[c]).

Digitized by Google

suggests one who possesses might such as that of a warrior (cf. Ps. 24^{8} Is. 42^{13} Jer. 20^{11}; also Is. $9^{5(6)}$ 10^{21}).—*Who regardeth not persons, nor taketh a bribe*] *i.e.* whom no consideration will deter from taking vengeance on the wrong-doer: cf. 28^{50}, also 1^{17} 16^{19}; and 16^{19} 27^{25} Ex. 23^{8}.—**18.** *Who executeth the judgment of the fatherless and the widow, and loveth the stranger*] *i.e.* who does not permit the helpless to be oppressed; for the combination, see on 14^{29}, and cf. 24^{17}. Justice, often so tardy and uncertain in the East, and hence inculcated so earnestly by Hebrew legislators and prophets, is meted out by Jehovah with absolute impartiality and strictness.—**19.** *Love, then, the stranger* (*sojourner*)*: for ye were strangers* (*sojourners*) *in the land of Egypt*] in your attitude towards the dependent foreigner imitate Jehovah, by not only treating him with justice (1^{16}), but also befriending him with the warmer affection of love. "Stranger" is the conventional rendering of גֵּר; but the sense of the Hebrew word would be better represented by "sojourner," which would also preserve the connexion with the corresponding verb in such passages as Gn. 12^{10} 19^{9} 47^{4} Is. 52^{4}. The term is really a technical one, and denotes the protected or dependent foreigner, settled for the time in Israel.

The social position of the Hebrew *gêr* may be illustrated from that enjoyed by the corresponding Arabic *jār* (pl. *jīrān*). "From an early date, the Semitic communities embraced, in addition to the free tribesmen of pure blood (Heb. *ezrāḥ*, Arab. *ṣarīḥ*) with their families and slaves, a class of men who were personally free, but had no political rights, viz. the protected strangers, of whom mention is so often made in the OT. and in early Arabic literature. The *gêr* was a man of another tribe or district who, coming to sojourn in a place where he was not strengthened by the presence of his own kin, put himself under the protection of a clan or of a powerful chief" (Smith, *Rel. Sem.* 75 f.; cf. *Kinship*, 41–43). In Israel, as is apparent from numerous allusions, the *gêr* was liable to be the victim of injustice and oppression; in JE the injunction not to oppress him is repeated twice, Ex. 22^{20} 23^{9}; he is to enjoy the rest of the Sabbath, 23^{12}, as he is also to observe it, 20^{10}. In Dt., it is again insisted, kindness and justice are to be dealt out to him (1^{16} 10^{19} $24^{14.17}$ 27^{19}); and he is repeatedly commended, by the side of the fatherless and the widow, to the Israelite's charity (14^{29} $16^{11.14}$ $24^{19.20.21}$ $26^{11.12.13}$): in $29^{10(11)}$, cf. Jos. $8^{33.35}$ (D^{2}), and 31^{12}, he is included with the Israelites generally among those who enter into Jehovah's covenant, and are under the obligation of observing the Deut. law; $16^{11.14}$ 26^{11} he may share in the joy of a sacred meal at a festival; 28^{43} if Israel is disobedient, he will increase in importance, and acquire supremacy over it. See further on 14^{21}.

Digitized by Google

The motive of the injunction, the recollection of the feelings of a sojourner, derived from the experiences of Egypt, agrees *verbatim* with Ex. $22^{20\,(21)}$ 23^{9} (JE), Lev. 19^{34} (H).—**20 f.** A God owning such august attributes it is Israel's duty to regard with reverence, devotion, and praise.—*Jehovah thy God thou shalt fear, &c.*] repeated from 6^{13}: the duty of "cleaving" to Him, as 11^{22} $13^{5\,(4)}$ 30^{20} (cf. on 4^{4}).—**21.** *He is thy praise*] *i.e.* the object of thy praise: cf. Jer. 17^{14} (כי תהלתי אתה).—*Who hath done with thee, &c.*] the relative clause suggests the reason why Jehovah is worthily Israel's praise and Israel's God. Cf. Ex. 15^{11} (poet.) נוֹרָא תְהִלֹּת; and the expansion of the theme in Dt. 11^{2-7}.—*Which thine eyes have seen*] 4^{9} 7^{19} $29^{2\,(3)}$.—**22.** The crowning evidence of Jehovah's claim for Israel's gratitude and regard (cf. 26^{5}).—*Threescore and ten persons*] so Gn. 46^{27} Ex. 1^{5} (P).—*As the stars of heaven for multitude*] 1^{10}.

XI. 1–9. Appeal to Israel to call to mind the wonders wrought by Jehovah on its behalf, as a motive to love and obedience.—*Love, therefore*] the enclitic "therefore" (Heb. וְ), not the emphatic "therefore" (עַל כֵּן or לָכֵן): so v.[8. 13] 4^{15} (*v.* phil. note) 6^{3} and often. Motives for the *fear* of God have been sufficiently indicated 10^{14-21}: the Writer now proceeds to emphasize more particularly the duty of *loving* Him (cf. on 6^{5}).—*And keep his charge*] (ושמרת משמרתו)] only here in Dt.: often in P (esp. Numbers), but usually in a technical sense, with genitive of the object to be kept, as Nu. 1^{53} 3^{28}: "Jehovah's charge" (of a specific duty), Lev. 8^{35} 18^{30} 22^{9} Nu. $9^{19.\,23}$; in a more general sense, as here, Gn. 26^{5} (JE), Jos. 22^{3} (D²), 1 K. 2^{3} (Deut.).—**2–7.** Let Israel (who has seen it) know, and take to heart, the discipline of Jehovah, *i.e.* (as v.[2b-6] explains) His great deeds in Egypt and the wilderness.—**2.** *And know ye this day* (*for* (I speak) *not with your children which have not known, and which have not seen*) *the discipline of Jehovah your God*] מוּסָר denotes neither *instruction* (see on 4^{36}), nor *chastise-*

21. אחך] cf. on 1^{30}; and עם 9^{7}.—**22.** בשבעים] the ב is the *Beth essentiæ* = "as": cf. $26^{5.\,14}$ (במםא) 28^{62} 33^{26}, and on 1^{13}.—לרב] 1^{10}.

XI. 2. The words כי לא . . . ראו are treated above (with Keil, Di., Oettli) as a parenth.: but possibly AV., RV., are right; after the series of clauses (v.[2b-6]) dependent on אשר לא ידעו וג', the words at the beginning כי לא את בניכם being forgotten, and left without a verb. Understand in

ment (though this may be included), but *moral education*, or *discipline* (𝔊 παιδία), attended with greater (Pr. 3^{11} Job 5^{17}) or less severity (Pr. $1^{2.8}$ 4^{1}), as the case may be: the sight of Jehovah's wonders, it is meant, ought to have exerted upon the Israelites a disciplinary influence, subduing waywardness and pride, promoting humility and reverence, and educating generally their moral and religious nature.—*His greatness*] 3^{24}.—*His mighty hand, &c.*] 4^{34}.—**3.** *Signs*] 4^{34}.—*His works, &c.*] cf. 4^{34} 6^{22} $7^{18f.}$: the thought of these passages is here drawn out in greater detail.—**4.** The passage of the Red Sea (Ex. 14).—*Unto this day*] 2^{22}.—**5.** The acts of mingled judgment and mercy wrought for Israel in the wilderness.—*Unto this place*] 1^{31}.—**6.** In particular, the Writer reminds Israel of the judgment upon Dathan and Abiram (Nu. 16).—*How the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up, and their households*] almost verbally as Nu. 16^{32a} (but פצתה, not פתחה, as Nu. 16^{30}, for "opened").—*And their tents*] cf. Nu. $16^{26.27b}$.—*All the* (living) *substance that followed them*] cf. Nu. $16^{30.33}$ (את) כל אשר להם. The silence respecting Ḳoraḥ, and the fate of his companions and sympathizers (Nu. 16^{35-50}), is remarkable and significant. Nu. 16 is of composite authorship, JE mentioning only Dathan and Abiram, P only Ḳoraḥ. The passages referred to all belong to JE; and the fact is a fresh corroboration of what has been said before, that the historical references of Dt. are based uniformly upon the narrative of JE, and do not presuppose that of P.—**7.** *Your eyes are those that saw*] 3^{21}.—*All the great work of Jehovah*] Jud. 2^{7} (Deut.).—**8–9.** The practical inference founded upon the preceding description of Jehovah's מוּסָר, the duty, viz. of obedience to His commands.—**8.** *That ye may be strong, and go in, &c.*] cf. 4^{1}.—*Whither ye are passing over, &c.*] 6^{1}.—**9.** *And that ye may prolong days, &c.*] cf. 4^{40}.—*Flowing with milk and honey*] 6^{3}.

10–17. A new motive to obedience: Canaan, unlike Egypt,

either case "do I speak."—**6.** ותבלעם ואת בתיהם] Nu. 16^{32} ותבלע אתם ואת בתיהם, which is more elegant and classical: the present type of sentence does not occur more than 11 or 12 times in the OT., as Dt. 15^{16} 1 S. 5^{10} להביתני ואת עמי (see note), 2 K. 20^{6}.—יְקוּם] Gn. $7^{4.23}$ (J)†. A rare and peculiar word, denoting properly *that which subsists*, (living) *substance*.—ברגליהם] *at their feet*, idiom. for *following them*: Ex. 11^{8} 1 S. 25^{27} *al.*

Digitized by Google

is dependent for its fertility upon the rain of heaven, which God will grant or withhold according as Israel is faithful or the reverse.—10. *Is not as the land of Egypt, whence ye came out, where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot*] the allusion is to the method by which the soil of Egypt was cultivated. In Egypt, as is well known, rain is exceedingly rare; and the crops are dependent, for their necessary moisture, upon the annual inundation of the Nile, and the system of artificial irrigation by which the waters of the river are stored, and distributed by canals, as occasion arises, over the fields. At present machines of various kinds are in use in Egypt for the purpose of raising water from the river or canals (Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, chap. xiv., ed. 1871, ii. pp. 25–27), though none (according to Robinson, *BR*. i. 581 f.) which illustrates the practice of "watering with the foot" here alluded to.

One of the commonest of these machines is the *Sāḳieh*, or water-wheel; this is usually turned by an ox, and raises the water by means of jars fastened to a circular or endless rope, which hangs over the wheel. "Possibly," writes Robinson, "in more ancient times the water-wheel may have been smaller, and turned, not by oxen, but by men pressing upon it with the foot, in the same way that water is still often drawn from wells in Palestine, as we afterwards saw [see ii. pp. 22, 226]. Niebuhr describes one such machine in Cairo, where it was called *Sāḳieh tedūr bir-rijl*, 'a watering-machine that turns by the foot,' a view of which he also subjoins [*Reisebeschreibung*, 1774, i. p. 149, with plate xv., reproduced in Riehm, *HWB*. p. 19]. The labourer sits on a level with the axis of the wheel or reel, and turns it by drawing the upper part towards him with his hands, pushing the rounds of the under part at the same time with his feet one after another. In Palestine the wheel or reel is more rude; and a single rope is used, which is wound up around it by the same process." It is possible, however, that the reference may be to the mode of distributing water from the canals over a field, by making or breaking down with the foot the small ridges which regulate its flow (see, of Egypt, Shaw, *Travels in Barbary, Algiers, &c.*, 1738, p. 431), or by using the foot for the purpose of opening and closing sluices. Conder (*Tent Work*, 1877, p. 328) speaks of vegetable gardens in Palestine as irrigated "by means of small ditches trodden by the foot."

As a garden of herbs] 1 K. 21^2 Pr. 15^7. The comparison seems intended to suggest that Egypt generally was irrigated by a method which in Palestine would be applied only to a

10b. אשר]=*where* (1^{31}).—תזרע . . . והשקיתה] "*usedst* to sow . . . and water"; Gn. 2^6 6^4 $29^{2\text{-}3}$ Ex. $33^{7.11}$ &c. (Dr. § 113. 4β; G-K. § 112. 3*a* α).

9

Digitized by Google

small garden of vegetables.—**11.** *According to the rain of heaven it drinketh water*] *i.e.* the supply of water is regulated by the rain. It is true that Canaan is also "a land of streams of water, of springs and deeps, issuing forth in vale and hill" (8^{7}); but water from these sources would be far from sufficient for the general irrigation of the country; and the crops are essentially dependent for their proper growth upon the two annual periods of rain referred to in v.^{14}.—**12.** *Careth for*] lit. *seeketh after* (דרשׁ), viz. with interest and care: cf. Job 3^{4} Jer. 30^{17} Is. 62^{12} Ez. 34^{6}.—*The eyes of Jehovah are continually upon it*] it is ever the object of His protecting regard: cf. (with אל) Ps. 33^{18} 34^{16}.—**13–17.** The enjoyment of this natural bounty of Palestine is dependent, however, upon the fidelity with which Israel remains devoted to the service of its God.—*To love and to serve, &c.*] 10^{12}.—**14.** *I will give*] on the first pers., see on 7^{4}.—*The former rain* (יוֹרֶה)] *i.e.* the autumnal rains, which begin in Oct.-Nov., at first intermittently, and allowing the husbandman time to sow his crops of wheat or barley, afterwards, till the end of December, falling heavily, and continuing at intervals through the winter.—*The latter rain* (מַלְקוֹשׁ)] *i.e.* the showers of March-April, which refresh and advance the ripening crops (the wheat-harvest beginning, in the plains, during the first half of May, and on the mountains in the first weeks of June: barley is ripe, in each case, a week or a fortnight earlier than the wheat). Upon the regularity of the autumnal and vernal rains the proper ripening of the crops depends. Comp. Jer. 5^{24} Joel 2^{23}; and for allusions, in particular, to the refreshing nature of the "latter rain," see Pr. 16^{15} Job 29^{23} Hos. 6^{3}; Jer. 3^{3} (withheld).—*Thy corn and thy wine and thine oil*] 7^{13}.—**15.** *Eat and be full*] as 6^{11} (see note) 8^{12} 31^{20}, a source of spiritual danger, and provocative of idolatry.—**16 f.** The admonition not to follow false gods is repeated (see $6^{14 f.}$ $8^{19 f.}$), accompanied by a warning suited to the present connexion, viz. that, if the temptation be

11. למטר השמים] rather an extreme case of the ל of *norm*, or *rule*: comp. 32^{8} (למספר . . .); Is. 11^{3} 32^{1} (לצדק, למשפט); 1 S. 23^{20} 2 S. 15^{11}; Job 42^{5} Ez. 12^{12} לעין (*i.e.* "as the eye sees it"; so here, "as the rain of heaven permits it"). See *Lex.* ל **1.** *b.*—כגן הירק] the art. after כ is generic: *Lex.* ה **f.**—**15.** ושׂבָעת] on 8^{10}.—**16–17.** וסרתם וג׳] the tenses as 4^{10}.—תתן את יבולה] Lev. $26^{4.20}$

Digitized by Google

indulged in, drought and famine may be expected as the consequences.—*Lest your heart be deceived*] Job 31^{27} (in a similar connexion).—*And Jehovah's anger be kindled against you*] 6^{15}. *And he shut up the heavens, and there be no rain*] cf. $28^{23f.}$ Lev. $26^{19f.}$; also 1 K. 8^{35} (Deut.).—*Perish quickly, &c.*] 4^{26}, cf. 28^{20}: also, with v.$^{16b.\,17b}$, Jos. 23^{16} (D^2).—*The good land*] 1^{35}.

18–25. Let Israel have these commandments in perpetual remembrance: the observance of them will be rewarded by national prosperity.—V.$^{18-20}$ are repeated, with slight variations of expression, from 6^{6-9} (where see notes).—**18.** *Lay, then, upon your heart, &c.*] cf. 6^6 "shall be upon thy heart." —**21.** *That your days, &c.*] comp. 4^{40} 6^2 11^9.—*As the days of the heavens above the earth*] *i.e.* as long as the heaven endures above (or resting on: Job 26^{11}) the earth, in other words, perpetually: cf. Ps. 89^{30} Job 14^{12}; also Ps. $72^{5.\,7.\,17}$.—**22.** *All this commandment, &c.*] cf. 8^1.—*To love, &c.*] v.^{13}.—*To walk in all his ways*] 8^6 10^{12}.—*To cleave to him*] 10^{20}.—**23.** *Dispossess* (והוריש)] $9^{4b.\,5b}$ (Ex. 34^{24}).—*Ye shall possess nations greater, &c.*] cf. 9^1.—**24–25.** Israel's reward shall be the complete and undisputed possession of the land of promise.—**24.** *Whereon the sole of your feet shall tread*] cf. 2^5 Jos. 1^3 (D^2) 14^9.—*From the wilderness, and Lebanon*] *i.e.* from the wilderness of et-Tih (p. 20), on the South of Palestine, and from Lebanon on the North. "One might be tempted to conjecture '*even unto* Lebanon' (ועד הלבנן); see, however, Jos. 1^4" (Dillm.).—*The river Euphrates*] this is named as the *ideal* limit of Israel's dominion on the East: see on 1^7.—*The hinder sea*] *i.e.* the Mediterranean Sea, as 34^2 Zech. 14^8 Joel 2^{20}†. Opp. is "the front sea" (הים הקדמני), *i.e.* the Dead Sea (Ez. 47^{18} Zech. 14^8 Joel 2^{20}). On the ground of the designation, see on v.^{29}.—**25.** *There shall not a man stand in your face* (בפניכם)] 7^{24}.—*The fear of you, and the dread of you shall Jehovah put, &c.*] cf. 2^{25}. *Whereon ye shall tread* (תדרכו)] cf. on 1^{36}.—*As he spake unto you*] Ex. 23^{27} (את אימתי אשלח לפניך): cf. Jos. 2^9.

26–32. The alternatives offered for Israel's choice: a bless-

Ez. 34^{27} Zech. 8^{12} Ps. 67^7 85^{13}†.—**18.** אלה] so (not האלה), as regularly after a noun with a suff., 1 K. 8^{59} 10^8 *al.* (Dr. § 209); cf. 5^{26} (זה).—**19.** בם] 6^7.—כל המקום] collect. = "every place": Ex. 20^{24} Lev. $15^{9.\,26}$ &c.—**25.** על פני] 2^{25}.

Digitized by Google

ing if it obeys the commandments of Jehovah, and a curse if it refuses them.—The verses form a suitable conclusion to the first part of Moses' discourse (c. 5–11), stating more concisely and emphatically than before the two alternatives set before Israel. The contents of both the blessing and the curse are drawn out at length in c. 28, which forms the solemn close of the entire Deuteronomic legislation. —**26.** See (רְאֵה)] 1^{8}.—*I set before you*] for your choice (on 4^{8}): so v.[32].—**27.** *Which I am commanding, &c.*] 4^{40}.—**28.** *And turn aside from the way*] $9^{12.16}$ 31^{29}.—*To go after other gods*] 6^{14}.—*Which ye have not known*] of which ye have had no experience, and which have consequently no claims upon your regard: so $13^{3.7.14}$ 28^{64} $29^{25(26)}$ 32^{17} (the Song).—**29–32.** When Israel has entered into Canaan, the blessing and the curse are, respectively, to be set symbolically upon Mount Gerizim, and Mount 'Ebal, in the heart of the country (cf. $27^{12f.}$; and see Jos. $8^{33f.}$).—**29.** *When Jehovah thy God shall bring thee into the land*] 6^{10} 7^{1}: cf. Ex. $13^{5.11}$.—*The blessing upon Mount Gerizim, and the curse upon Mount 'Ebal*] Gerizim and 'Ebal are, respectively, on the S. and the N. side of the fertile valley in which Shechem (the modern Nâbulus) lay: they were thus in the very centre of the land, close to an ancient sanctuary (Gn. 12^{6} $33^{18f.}$), the burial-place of Joshua (Jos. 24^{32}), often mentioned as a place of national gathering and political importance (Jos. 24^{1}; Jud. 9; 1 K. $12^{1.25}$). The ground why Gerizim is selected for the blessing, and 'Ebal for the curse, is probably (Schultz, Keil, Dillm.) that, from the point of view of the Hebrews, who conceived themselves as naturally looking Eastwards, in fixing the quarters of the heavens (cf. תֵּימָן, יָמִין, *the right hand*, of the South, קֶדֶם and עַל פְּנֵי, *in front*, of the East), Gerizim was on the right-hand side, which was regarded as the side of good fortune (cf. Gn. 35^{18}; Mt. 25^{33}). On the manner in which the ceremony is conceived by the Writer, see $27^{12f.}$.—**30.** The position of the two mountains more closely defined.—*Beyond Jordan*] from the standpoint of the speaker, as $3^{20.25}$.—*Behind the way of the going down of the sun*] *i.e.* on the other side of the great

27. אשר] nearly = *if* (cf. אם v.[28]). A rare usage (*Lex.* אשר **8 d**): Lev. 4^{22} Jos. 4^{21}.—**30.** מול] *in front of* (3^{29} Ex. 34^{3} 1 S. 17^{30} *al.*),—the position

Digitized by Google

westerly road, leading through Palestine from N. to S., which must have passed formerly, as it passes still, through the plain E. of Shechem: cf. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. 658 f. (Knob.) = *Geogr. of Palestine* (transl.) iv. 293 ff. *In the land of the Canaanite, that dwelleth in the 'Arábah*] the 'Arábah, or Jordan-valley (p. 3), is at a considerable distance from 'Ebal and Gerizim: but it seems that it is named here, partly as being a district of Palestine specially associated with the "Canaanite" (Nu. 13^{29} Jos. 11^{3}: cf. pp. 11, 13 f.), partly as being immediately in view of "the ravine in front of Beth-Pe'or" (3^{29}), the assumed position of the speaker.—*In front of Gilgal* (מול הגלגל)] the words are difficult; and the locality intended is uncertain. From its being named for the purpose of defining the position of 'Ebal and Gerizim, it would seem to be some well-known place; and hence it is natural, in the first instance, to think of the Gilgal near Jericho (Jos. $4^{19f.}$ $5^{9f.}$ 1 S. 7^{16} &c.). In spite of the objection that this lies too far from 'Ebal and Gerizim—some 28 miles to the SSE.—to be chosen as a landmark, it seems most probable, on the whole, that it is the place intended; the words, it may be supposed, being meant to indicate, that, speaking loosely and generally, from the point of view of one looking Westwards, from a site at the foot of Nebo, 'Ebal and Gerizim would be "in front of" this well-known spot in the Jordan-valley opposite (see p. xxi).

The word *Gilgal* (cf. גלגל *wheel*) means *a round* or *circle*, viz. of stones, or (in modern parlance) a *cromlech*: the art. (הגלגל) shows (see *Lex.* ה 2) that the appellative sense of the word was still felt. The popular etymology in Jos. 5^{9}, connecting it with גלל *to roll* (*away*), does not express the real origin of the word. Such stone-circles (which were no doubt esteemed sacred) might naturally be found in different parts of the country, though the most celebrated was the one near Jericho; and one or other of these has been thought by some commentators to be intended here.

Thus Knob. supposes that the place meant is either the Γαλγουλις of Euseb. (*Onom.* p. 245), 6 miles W. of Antipatris (which he identifies with Kilkilia, a village a little E.-NE. of Kefr Saba, about 18 miles W. of 'Ebal and Gerizim), or a village still called Jiljuleh, some 2 miles to the S. of Kilkilia. Keil (and so *HWB.*, and Schenkel, *BL. s.v.*) thinks of Jiljilia, a large village lying on a ridge 2441 feet above the level of the sea, and commanding an extensive prospect towards both the Mediterranean and

---

indicated in any particular case depending, of course, upon the direction in which the determining object is viewed or approached.

Digitized by Google

the mountains of Gile'ad (Rob. ii. 265), about 13 miles S. of Gerizim, and 3 miles to the W. of the great road leading from Jerusalem through Bethel to the North of Palestine, in the latitude of Sinjil (perhaps the "Gilgal" meant in 2 K. 2^{1} 4^{38}). Though the present writer understood on the spot that Jiljilia was visible on a clear day from the *top* of Gerizim, yet the heights of the intervening mountains (as exhibited in the large map of the Palestine Exploration Society) show that it can have formed no particularly conspicuous landmark; and as it is certainly not visible from the plain at the foot of 'Ebal and Gerizim, it is not easy to understand why it should have been selected for the purpose of defining the position of these mountains, nor is it clear in what sense two mountains, situated 13 miles N. of Jiljilia, should be described, especially from a standpoint E. of Jordan, as "in front of it." Knobel's and Keil's proposed sites have also the disadvantage of being (so far as appears) places of no importance or note. Others have sought to relieve the difficulty of the verse by punctuating differently: thus (1) "the Canaanite that dwelleth in the 'Arábah in front of Gilgal" (Colenso, *The New Bible Comm.* [the "Speaker's Comm."] *critically examined*, 1873, v. 67), the words being taken to define the part of the 'Arábah inhabited by the "Canaanites"; (2) "in front of the stone-circle beside the terebinths of Moreh" (suggested by Dillm.), the words being supposed to denote a spot close to Shechem. If this "stone-circle beside the terebinths of Moreh" could be supposed to have been located in the plain E. of 'Ebal and Gerizim, through which the highway mentioned just before still runs, the words would define very suitably the position of the two mountains. But it is an objection to this view, that it makes the defining landmark, not the well-known "terebinths of Moreh" itself, but an otherwise unmentioned stone-circle beside it.

Beside the terebinths of Moreh (אצל אלוני מורה)] or "*of* (the) *director*," mentioned also (with *terebinth*, for *terebinths*, as is read also by Sam. 𝔊 here) in Gen. 12^{6} as close to Shechem (cf. also 35^{4} [הָאֵלָה]). The name, it is probable, is that of an oracular tree (or grove); and if *Moreh* be rightly taken not as a proper name, but as an appellative, as the verb הורה is used of the authoritative "direction" given by priests (on 17^{10}), it will denote the priest (or company of priests) who gave answers to those who came to consult the oracle.

Perhaps the same tree is meant by the "Soothsayers' Terebinth" (אלן מעננים) of Jud. 9^{37}, likewise near Shechem, if not also by the אֵלָה—as it is now pointed, though the original pronunciation may have been אַלָּה—"in the sanctuary of Jehovah," at Shechem, mentioned Jos. 24^{26}. On sacred trees among Semitic peoples (who in some cases treated them as actual gods, and paid them divine honours), and on the methods of divination from them, see W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.* pp. 169 ff., 178 f.; and Baudissin, *Sem. Rel.-Gesch.* 1878, ii. p. 184 ff. (among the Hebrews, pp. 223–230).

31. The reason why this injunction has now been given to

Digitized by Google

them: the Israelites are about to enter upon the permanent occupation of Canaan.—**32.** Concluding exhortation to obedience.—*Observe to do*] on 4^{6}.

XII.–XXVI. XXVIII. *The Code of Special Laws.*

These chapters form the second part of the principal discourse of Deuteronomy (c. 5–26. 28), embracing, under its more practical aspects, the exposition of Israelitish law, promised in 1^{5}, and particularizing in detail the "statutes and judgments" (4^{1} 5^{1}), ceremonial, civil, and criminal, by which the daily life of the Israelite was to be regulated. So far as the more technical nature of the subject admits, the treatment and style continue the same as in c. 5–11; the same theocratic principles are insisted on, the same parenetic tone prevails, the same stress is laid upon the motives of devotion to God, and large-hearted benevolence towards man, by which the Israelite is to be actuated. The laws, as a rule, are not (as is mostly the case, for instance, in Ex. 21–23) promulgated, merely as such: they are generally enforced by hortatory comments and explanations, and sometimes they are developed at considerable length. The arrangement is not throughout entirely systematic, and here and there some displacement may have occurred: but on the whole the principles determining the order followed by the Writer are tolerably plain. The following is an outline of the subjects embraced *:—

1. Sacred observances (12^{1}–16^{17}):—
    - *a.* Law of the single sanctuary (12^{1-28}).
    - *b.* Repression of idolatry (12^{29}–$13^{19\,(18)}$).
    - *c.* Holiness of the laity (14^{1-21}).
    - *d.* Sacred dues and sacred seasons (14^{22}–16^{17}).
2. Office-bearers of the theocracy:—
    - *a.* Judges (16^{18-20} 17^{8-13}).†
    - *b.* King (17^{14-20}).
    - *c.* Priests (18^{1-8}).
    - *d.* Prophets (18^{9-22}).
3. Criminal law (c. 19; 21^{1-10}‡):—
    - *a.* Homicide and murder (19^{1-13}).

* Comp. Wellh. *Comp.* p. 205 f.; Westphal, p. 38 f.

† 16^{21}–17^{7} belong to No. 1*b*. ‡ C. 20 belongs to No. 4.

Digitized by Google

b. Encroachment on property (19^{14}).
c. False witness (19^{15-21}).
d. Expiation of an uncertain murder (21^{1-9}).

4. Miscellaneous laws, relating (mostly) to civil and domestic life (21^{10}–c. 25), not systematically arranged, but embracing such subjects as—the conduct of war 21^{10-14} (with c. 20); family law (primogeniture, seduction, divorce, &c.), 21^{15-21} 22^{13-30} 24^{1-5} 25^{5-10}; interest and loans $23^{20f. (19f.)}$ $24^{6, 10-13}$; just weights 25^{13-16}.

5. Parenetic conclusion (c. 26), and peroration (c. 28).

C. 27 interrupts the discourse of Moses with a piece of narrative, containing injunctions foreign to the context on both sides (see the notes *ad loc.*).

For a detailed synopsis of the laws, arranged in tabular form, with the parallels in Ex.–Nu., as well as for a discussion of the relation in which the Deuteronomic legislation, viewed generally, stands to the other Codes of the Pentateuch, the reader is referred to the Introduction (§§ 1, 2).

XII.–XIII. *Laws designed to secure the Purity of Religious Worship.*

XII. In Canaan, the places at which the native Canaanites served their gods are to be destroyed, and Jehovah is to be worshipped publicly at one place only, to be selected by Himself.—The Code of special laws (c. 12–26) begins, like the "Book of the Covenant" and the "Law of Holiness" (Ex. 20^{23-26}; Lev. 17^{1-9}), with injunctions respecting the *place*, and the *character*, of the public worship of Jehovah.—Of the two main topics dealt with in c. 12, viz. (1) the destruction of the Canaanitish places of worship, (2) the limitation of the public worship of Jehovah to a single sanctuary, the parallels in the other Codes are, for (1)—though with reference only to the religious symbols of the Canaanites, not to the places, as such, at which their rites were observed—Ex. $23^{24. 32f.}$ 34^{12-16} (JE), comp. also (more generally) 20^{23} $22^{19 (20)}$ 34^{17}; Nu. $33^{52f.}$ (H); and for (2) Ex. $20^{24f.}$ (JE), Lev. 17^{1-9} (H). The relation of the last two passages to the law of Dt. gives rise, however, to difficulty, and needs discussion. Ex. $20^{24f.}$ lays no stress upon sacrifice being confined to a single spot, but directs it to be offered upon an altar built, in simple fashion, of earth or unhewn stone, and attaches to such worship the promise, "In

Digitized by Google

whatever place I cause my name to be remembered (or commemorated), I will come unto thee, and bless thee." The reference here cannot, for many reasons (see *ad loc.*), be to the altar of burnt-offering before the Tabernacle, as described in P (Ex. 27^{1-8} &c.): not only, for instance, is a far simpler structure manifestly in the writer's mind, but the alternatives offered (earth or unhewn stone) are an indication that the law is meant quite generally, and that its intention is to authorize the erection of altars, built in the manner prescribed, in any part of the land. With the plurality of altars, thus sanctioned, agrees not merely, in pre-Mosaic times, the practice of the patriarchs, who are often in JE stated to have built altars, and worshipped, especially at spots where Jehovah had manifested Himself to them (Gn. $12^{7.8}$ $13^{4.18}$ $22^{9.13}$ 26^{25} 33^{20} $35^{1.3.7}$ 46^{1}: cf. Ex. 17^{15}), but also the usage of the Israelites generally, between the ages of Moses and Solomon.

During this period the historical books imply the existence of sanctuaries (other than that at which the Ark was stationed), and speak frequently of the erection of altars, and of sacrifice, not only on occasion of a theophany, or in obedience to an express command (as Jos. $8^{30f.}$ Jud. 2^{5} 6^{26} $13^{16.19}$ 2 S. 24^{25}), but also independently, Jos. $24^{1.26}$ 1 S. $7^{9f.17}$ 9^{12-14} (at a *high-place*), $10^{3.5.8}$ $13^{9f.}$ 11^{15} 14^{35} (the *first* of the altars built by Saul to Jehovah), 20^{6} 2 S. $15^{7f.12.32}$ ("where men *used to worship* God"), 1 K. 3^{4} ("the great high-place" at Gibe'on, at which Solomon was accustomed (יעלה) to sacrifice). In none of these notices is there any mark of disapproval, or any intimation, on the part of either the actors or the narrator, that a law such as that of Dt. is being infringed: in 1 S. 9^{12-14} 10^{3-5} it is especially evident that ordinary and regular customs are described. Although, therefore, in the earlier centuries of Israelitish history, the sanctuary at which the Ark was stationed had naturally the pre-eminence, and was the centre to which annual pilgrimages were made (cf. Ex. $23^{14-17.19}$ [first-fruits to be brought to "the *house* of Jehovah"]; Jud. 21^{19}; 1 S. $1^{3.7.21}$), it cannot be doubted that other local sanctuaries existed in different parts of the land, and that sacrifice offered at them was considered perfectly legitimate. (Cf. Ex. $22^{29\,(30)}$, which also presupposes local sanctuaries: see on 15^{20}.)

The local sanctuaries, in spite of the splendour and *éclat* of the Temple built by Solomon, retained their popularity through the period of the Kings: the Deuteronomic compiler of the Books of Kings notes repeatedly how the people continued to sacrifice at them, and even the good kings did not remove them (1 K. $3^{2.3}$ 14^{23} 15^{14} 22^{43} 2 K. $12^{4\,(3)}$ 14^{4} $15^{4.35}$ 16^{4}). Comp.

Digitized by Google

also 1 K. 18^{30b} $19^{10.14}$. Time however showed how impossible it was to secure them against abuse, and to preserve the worship conducted at them from contamination with Canaanitish idolatry (cf. 1 K. $14^{23f.}$; 11^{7} 2 K. 23^{13}; Jer. 7^{31} 17^{3} 19^{5}); the abolition of them was attempted, though with only temporary success, by Hezekiah (2 K. $18^{4.22}$ 21^{3}): in Dt. they are formally declared illegal, legitimate sacrifice being expressly restricted to the single sanctuary; and to the Deuteronomic ideal Josiah gave practical effect in his reforms (2 K. $23^{5.8}$). The law of Dt. thus marks an epoch in the history of Israelitish religion: it springs from an age when the old law (Ex. 20^{24}), sanctioning an indefinite number of local sanctuaries, had been proved to be incompatible with purity of worship; it marks the final, and most systematic, effort made by the prophets to free the public worship of Jehovah from heathen accretions.

The gist of Lev. 17^{1-9} is (1) to prohibit the slaughter, even for purposes of food, of any animal of a kind that might be offered in sacrifice, without its being presented to Jehovah at the Tabernacle, in the manner of a peace-offering, v.$^{1-7}$; and (2) to forbid burnt-offering or sacrifice being offered except at the same place, v.$^{8-9}$. The principle on which the first of these prohibitions depends is explained below, on v.$^{15f.}$: the aim of the second is to insure sacrifice in general being offered exclusively to Jehovah. In view of Ex. 20^{24}, and of the other passages, just quoted, illustrating the practice of the period from Moses to Solomon, it is extremely difficult to think that Lev. 17^{1-9} (accepting it, in substance, as pre-Deuteronomic) can still be in its original form. The full discussion of this subject belongs to a Commentary on Leviticus; but the most probable opinion is that, as originally formulated (as part of the "Law of Holiness"), Lev. 17^{1-9} had no reference to a central sanctuary (the "Tent of Meeting"), but presupposed a *plurality* of legitimate sanctuaries, and was only accommodated to the single sanctuary, by a modification in its phraseology, when it was incorporated in P. In its more original form, the law will have harmonized of course with Ex. 20^{24}; and its special aim will have been to insist on sacrifices being offered to Jehovah alone instead of to the imaginary demons of the desert, to whom (v.^{7}) the Israelites were prone to offer them. This view of the passage is taken by Kittel, *Theol. Studien aus Württemberg*, 1881, p. 42 ff., *Gesch. d. Hebräer*, i. 99; Dillm. on Lev. 17^{3}; Baudissin, *Gesch. des AT.lichen Priesterthumes*, p. 47: comp. W. R. Smith, *Addit. Answ. to the Libel*, Edinb. 1878, pp. 61–64; and *Leviticus*, by H. A. White and the present writer, in Haupt's "Sacred Books of the OT." (1894).

1. *These are the statutes, &c.*] the words are of the nature of a superscription to c. 12–26: cf. 5^{1} 6^{1}.—*All the days, &c.*]

XII. 1. נָתַן] *hath given*, viz. in effect (3^{2}). Usu. in Dt. נֹתֵן; but the

Digitized by Google

4^{10} 31^{13}.—**2–3. All Canaanitish places of worship are to be destroyed.**—A fundamental and necessary condition for the pure and uncontaminated worship of Jehovah (v.$^{5ff.}$).—*Upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every spreading tree*] the favourite sites chosen by the Canaanites for their idolatrous observances. Worship at these spots, accompanied often by licentious rites, is frequently alluded to in the period of the Kings. Thus Hosea (*c.* 750) writes (4^{13}): "They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under the oak, and the poplar, and the terebinth, because the shade thereof is good: therefore your daughters commit whoredom, and your brides commit adultery": Isaiah, shortly afterwards, speaks of the terebinths, and gardens, in which the idolatrous Judahites delighted (1^{29}); in the age of Jeremiah, the standing phrase, in connexion with idolatrous observances, is "upon every high hill, and under every spreading tree," Jer. 2^{20} (cf. 3^{6} 17^{2}); 1 K. 14^{23} 2 K. 17^{10}, cf. 16^{4} (all Deut.); Ez. 6^{13} (cf. 20^{28}); "upon the mountains," Ez. $18^{6.\,11.\,15}$ 22^{9} Is. 65^{7}; "under every spreading tree," Is. 57^{5} Jer. 3^{13}. The fact that such spots were selected by the Canaanites for their idolatrous rites, and often, it is probable, adopted from them by the immigrant Israelites, caused them naturally to be regarded with strong disfavour by Hebrew legislators and prophets. The "places" alluded to are no doubt the בָּמוֹת, or artificial mounds (AV. "high-places"), with accompanying shrine, or chapel (בית: 1 K. 12^{31} 13^{32}, cf. Ez. 16^{16}), altar, &c., erected ("built" 2 K. 21^{3} *al.*; "made," *ib.* 23^{15} *al.*) in such localities (*e.g.* 1 K. 11^{7} 14^{23} Ez. 6^{13} $20^{28f.}$): see more fully on Nu. 33^{52} (H) ואת כל במותם תשמידו.

Why the sites referred to were chosen for religious purposes, is not definitely stated, and can only be inferred by conjecture. Trees may have

---

position (*before* the subj.) shows that the punct. is correct.—**2.** המקומות] the word may possibly, like the Arab. *maḳām*, have acquired in Heb. the sense of "*sacred place*"; Gn. 12^{6} 28^{11} 1 S. 7^{16} (cf. 𝔊) Jer. 7^{12}.—ירשים] on 9^{1}.—רענן] not *green*, but *spreading*, *luxuriant*,—always, except Ps. 92^{11} (שמן רענן) ^{15} (of the righteous, under the fig. of a tree), Dan. 4^{1} (Aram.), of trees or leaves. The etym. is not certain. Arab. *ra'una* is *to be* (mentally) *lax*, *flaccid*, *weak: possibly*, therefore, the primary meaning of the root may have been *to fall abroad loosely*, in Heb. used lit. of trees, in Arab. applied fig. to the mind. 𝔊 *δασύς*, *ἀλσώδης*, *εὔσκιος*, *κατάσκιος*, *σύσκιος*.

Digitized by Google

been selected, partly for the reason assigned by Hosea, viz. on account of their shade, but partly also because they were often regarded as sacred (on 11^{30}); and hill tops, it is generally supposed, were chosen as being open to heaven, and nearer than other points of earth to the heavenly gods (for another conjecture, see W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.* pp. 352, 356, 358, 470 f.). Among the Israelites, also, sacred associations gathered round the same spots; and both religious ceremonies, and theophanies, are described as taking place on mountain-tops, or other eminences (*e.g.* Gn. 22^{2} Jud. 6^{26} 1 S. 9$^{12.14.19}$ 10^{5} 2 S. 15^{32} 1 K. 18$^{19.30}$; cf. the "mount of God," of Horeb, Ex. 3^{1} 4^{27} 24^{13} 1 K. 19^{8}), and under sacred trees (Gn. 12$^{6f.}$ 13^{18} 18^{1} 21^{33} Jos. 24^{26} Jud. 6$^{11.19.24}$).—See further, on sacred trees, on 11^{30}; and on sacred hills, Baudissin, *Sem. Rel.-Gesch.* ii. 231 ff., 252 ff.

3. *Ye shall break down, &c.*] nearly as 7^{5} (Ex. 23^{24} 34^{13}). The command is naturally repeated here, as giving completeness to the injunction of v.^{2}. On the "pillars" (obelisks) and "Ashérim," see on 16$^{21.22}$.—*Cause their name to perish* (7^{24}) *out of that place*] the very names of the deities once venerated at it are to be forgotten (Zeph. 1^{4} Zech. 13^{2}).

4–7. Only at one spot, to be chosen by Himself, are sacrifices, and other sacred dues, to be presented to Jehovah.— 4. *Ye shall not do so, &c.*] *i.e.* not worship Him, at every spot without distinction, and with idolatrous rites.—**5.** *Unto the place which Jehovah your God shall choose*] the standing phrase in Dt. for the central sanctuary 12$^{14.18.26}$ 14^{25} 15^{20} 16$^{7.15.16}$ 17$^{8.10}$ 18^{6} 31^{11} Jos. 9^{27} (D^{2}), with the addition (as here) "to set (לָשׂוּם) his name there" 12^{21} 14^{24}, and "to cause his name to dwell (לְשַׁכֵּן) there" 12^{11} 14^{23} 16$^{2.6.11}$ 26^{2}. The expression occurs nowhere else in the Hex., though the idea that the place of sacrifice is to be appointed by God, not by man, agrees with Ex. 20^{24b}. Of course the place tacitly designated by the expression is Jerusalem, which is described similarly in passages of Kings due to the Deut. compiler, as the city which Jehovah has "chosen," 1 K. 8$^{44.48}$ (cf. v.^{16}) 11$^{13.32.36}$ 14^{21} 2 K. 21^{7} 23^{27}.

3. ואבדתם את שמם] cf. Is. 26^{14}; c. 7^{24} (האביד).—**5.** כי אם אל המקום אשר . . . לְשִׁכְנוֹ תדרשו ובאת שמה] the construction is uncertain. (1) The Massorites, by placing the *athnaḥ* at שם, perh. also by vocalizing שִׁ (not שָׁ, as Ex. 29^{46}: yet cf. מִקְרָם, נִפְלוֹ by the side of מִקְרָה, נָפְלוֹ, Ols. § 245^{b}, G-K. § 61. R.^{1}) show that they treat שכנו as a subst., *dwelling*, connecting לשכנו with תדרשו, and regarding it as resumptive of אל המקום: in this case there will be an anacoluthon, אל at the beginning being governed by the verb of motion, which is implicitly in the writer's mind, but the construction being broken by the insertion of לשכנו תדרשו. A subst. שֶׁכֶן

Digitized by Google

On the theological application of the word *choose*, see further on 4^{37}: the idea is a favourite one with writers of the Deut. school.—*Out of all your tribes*] comp. 1 K. 8^{16} 11^{32} 14^{21} 2 K. 21^{7} (all Deut.).—*To set his name there*] so v.^{21} 14^{24} 1 K. 9^{3} 11^{36} 2 K. $21^{4.7}$; comp. the parallel phrases "to cause his name to dwell (לְשַׁכֵּן) there," v.^{11} 14^{23} $16^{2.6.11}$ 26^{2} Jer. 7^{12} (of Shiloh) Ezra 6^{12} Neh. 1^{9}† (cf. Ps. 74^{7}), and "that my name may be there" 1 K. $8^{16.29}$ 2 K. 23^{27}.

The *name*, with the Hebrews, is the expression of the nature—hence the prophets, when they wish to describe a person or place by its real character, often say that it will be *called* or *named* accordingly, Is. 1^{26} 4^{3} 30^{7} $62^{4.12}$ Ez. 48^{35} &c.: "the 'name of Jehovah' is thus the compendious expression of His character and attributes, as He has revealed them to men" (Kirkpatrick on Ps. 5^{11}): to act "for His name's sake" (Ps. 23^{3} 31^{4} 143^{11} Is. 48^{9} Jer. $14^{7.21}$ *al.*) is to act in such a manner as not to belie His revealed nature. Jehovah's revealed nature is specially associated with His people, Israel, and with His sanctuary in its midst: hence He will not forsake His people; for when Israel suffers contumely or reproach, it is His own name which is profaned (1 S. 12^{22} Is. 48^{11} Ez. $20^{9.14.22}$ 36^{20-23}); and the sanctuary is the place of Jehovah's "name," because He there vouchsafes the special tokens of His presence and graciously responds to His servants' devotions (comp. Oehler, *OT. Theol.* § 56; Schultz, *OT. Theol.* p. 514f. [ii. 123f.]). The term is first found in connexion with a sanctuary in the Book of the Covenant, Ex. 20^{24} "in every place where I will cause my name to be remembered (*or* commemorated) (בכל המקום אשר אזכיר שמי שם)" —viz. in consequence of some manifestation of my presence—"I will come unto thee, and bless thee." Isaiah (18^{7}) calls the Temple "the place of Jehovah's *name*" (cf. Jer. 3^{17}); and the expression "to build an house to Jehovah's name" is found 2 S. 7^{13} 1 K. 3^{2} $5^{17.19\,(3.5)}$ $8^{17-20.44.48}$ (all Deut.).

(Even) *to his dwelling shall ye seek* (תדרשו)] *i.e.* resort thither for religious purposes; comp. Am. 5^{5} ואל תדרשו ביתאל, and with *God* as obj. Gn. 25^{22} 1 S. 9^{9} *al.* (cf. on 18^{11}).—**6.** Thither all sacrifices, and other sacred dues, are to be brought: viz. (1) and (2) *burnt-offerings and sacrifices* (זבחים), the two commonest

does not, however, occur elsewhere: hence (2) Knob., Keil, Oettli, and others, disregarding the *athnaḥ*, render as an inf., "that he (*or* it) may dwell (there)," *i.e.* that His presence there may be an abiding one. The objection to (2) is that לשכנו is then somewhat otiose (for לשום את שמו שם—see above—is a synonym of לשכן שמו שם), and comes in lamely at the end of the sentence, nor is דרש construed elsewhere with אל of the *place* resorted to; the sentence also is decidedly more forcible, if אל המקום be resumed, after the long intervening relative clause, by a synonym such as לשכנו.—ובאת] Sam. 𝔊 ובאתם; cf. however v.$^{7.9}$, and see on 1^{21}.

Digitized by Google

kinds of sacrifice, often mentioned together, especially in general designations of sacrifice (Ex. 10^{25} 18^{12} Jos. $22^{26.\ 28}$ 1 S. 6^{15} 15^{22} 2 K. 5^{17} (Naʿaman) Jer. 7^{22}), the "sacrifice" specially intended in such cases by זבחים being doubtless the thank-offering (שלמים), which in other similar passages seems to be combined with עולות as a parallel to זבחים (*e.g.* Ex. 20^{24} 24^{5} 32^{6} 1 S. 10^{8} 13^{9}). On these forms of sacrifice, see more fully on Lev. 1. 3; cf. Wellh. *Hist.* p. 69 ff.; (3) *tithes*, see on 14^{22}; (4) *the contribution* (*heave-offering*) *of your hand*, *i.e.* "what the hand *lifts off* (הֵרִים) from the produce of the soil, Nu. 15^{19}" (Oettli), as a *contribution* to the service of the Deity. The usage of the term makes it probable that the reference is partly to the first-fruits, a regular and ancient offering (Ex. $23^{16.\ 19}$ in JE; Dt. 26^{2}; cf. Nu. 18^{12} in P), which would otherwise not be alluded to in the enumeration, partly to other voluntary offerings, taken from the produce of the soil, such as were presented at the three annual pilgrimages (see $16^{10f.\ 14.\ 16b\text{-}17}$).

"Heave-offering" (*terūmāh*) is a term belonging to the priestly terminology, being used principally by P and the priestly prophet Ezekiel. An examination of the passages in which תרומה, and the cognate verb הֵרִים, occur, shows that it does not imply any rite of "elevation," but that it denotes properly what is *lifted off* a larger mass, or separated from it, for sacred purposes (𝔊 often ἀφαίρεμα; 𝔗 אפרשותא,—both expressing the idea of *separation*: so also Ges. *s.v.*, Knob. and Di. on Lev. 7^{32}, Keil on Lev. 2^{9}, Oehler, *OT. Theol.* § 133, &c.). תרומה is thus used of contributions of money, spoil, &c., offered for sacred purposes, Ex. $25^{2f.}$ Nu. 18^{8} (of the sacrifices named in v.[9], treated generally as contributions to the sanctuary) $31^{29.\ 41}$ Ez. $45^{13.\ 16}$ Ezr. 8^{25}; Ez. $45^{1.\ 6.\ 7}$ *al.* of land reserved for the priests and Levites. In connexion with sacrifices תרומה is only used specially of portions "taken off" from the rest, and forming the priest's due (*e.g.* Lev. 7^{14}, and esp. the "heave-thigh," which, with the "wave-breast," was the priest's share of the thank-offering, *ib.* $7^{32.\ 34}$ *al.*). For הרים, see Lev. 2^{9} 4^{19} $6^{8\,(15)}$; and for הרים תרומה combined, Ex. 35^{24} Nu. $15^{19.\ 20}$ $18^{19.\ 24}$ Ez. 45^{1} (of *land*). Used absolutely, תרומה commonly denotes gifts taken from the produce of the land, whether the tithe, or first-fruits and firstlings; so not only 2 S. 1^{21} (if the text be sound), Nu. $15^{19\text{-}21}$ 18^{11} (see v.[12f.]) [24. 26. 28. 29], but also 2 Ch. $31^{10.\ 12.\ 14}$ (see v.[5. 6]) Neh. $10^{38.\ 40\,(37.\ 39)}$ 12^{44} 13^{5} Ez. 20^{40} 44^{30} Mal. 3^{8} ("tithe and *terūmāh*," as here). תרומה is sometimes in AV. RV. represented by *offering*, *oblation*, the usual rendering of קרבן; but in Hebrew the two words differ in their application considerably. קָרְבָּן denotes an offering as "brought near," or "presented," and is applied especially to sacrifices, Lev. 1^{3} 2^{1} 3^{1} and frequently [79 times: except Ez. 20^{28} 40^{43}, always in P (or H)]: תרומה corresponds rather to "contribution," and is only used exceptionally in connexion with sacrifices.

Digitized by Google

The addition "of your hand" (so v.^{17}: cf. 15^{2} $16^{10.\,17}$) marks the *terūmāh* as the worshipper's personal offering, rendered by him deliberately and willingly.—(5) and (6) *Your vows and your free-will offerings*, *i.e.* extraordinary sacrifices, offered either in performance of a vow, or from a spontaneous impulse on the part of the giver. Such sacrifices might take the form of either thank-offerings (שלמים) or burnt-offerings (Lev. $22^{18.\,21}$), though the former appears to have been the more usual (Lev. 7^{16}): see on these passages.—(7) *The firstlings of your oxen and of your sheep*: see $15^{19\text{-}23}$; Ex. $13^{2.\,12f.}$ $22^{29\,(30)}$ $34^{19f.}$ (JE); Nu. $18^{15\text{-}18}$ (P).—**7.** *And there ye shall eat, &c.*] in the case of such offerings (notably the thank-offerings) as were accompanied by a sacrificial meal, the worshipper's family and household were to share it with him: so v.^{18} $14^{23.\,26}$ (tithes), 15^{20} (firstlings), cf. 27^{7}. For other allusions to "eating," as an act of worship, or communion, accompanying sacrifice, see Gn. $31^{46.\,54}$ Ex. 18^{12} 24^{11} 1 S. 9^{13} Ps. $22^{30\,(29)}$; in the service of false gods Ex. 34^{15} Nu. 25^{2}.—*Before Jehovah*] *i.e.* at the sanctuary, as v.$^{12.\,18}$ $14^{23.\,26}$, and frequently (1 S. $1^{12.\,15}$ Lev. $1^{5.\,11}$ &c.).—*And ye shall rejoice on account of all that ye put your hand to*] מִשְׁלַח יָד (peculiar to Dt.) denotes an *undertaking*, *enterprise*, especially one connected with agriculture (synon. מַעֲשֵׂה יָד: see on 2^{7}) v.^{18} 15^{10} 23^{21} $28^{8.\,20}$†. The Israelite, when he brings his offerings to the sanctuary, and partakes of the sacrificial meal which a bounteous year has enabled him to provide, is to thank Jehovah with a joyous heart for the success with which his labours have been blessed.—*Hath blessed thee*] 2^{7}.

8–14. This centralization of public worship is to come into operation as soon as Israel is secure in Canaan.—8. The irregular, arbitrary worship of the wilderness is not to continue indefinitely. Comp. Am. 5^{25}, where it is implied that sacrifices were not offered in the wilderness.—*Every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes*] comp. Jud. 17^{6} 21^{25} (of the period when there was no king in Israel to preserve discipline and order). By *here* and *to-day* is meant the period of the people's sojourn in the field of Moab. At the same time, as Oettli remarks, the terms of the description are no doubt coloured by the cir-

7. אשר] = *wherein*; cf. on 7^{19}.

Digitized by Google

cumstances of the writer's own day, when sacrifice was offered, with probably a lax ritual, at the local sanctuaries.—**9.** The excuse for such irregularities: Israel has not yet entered into the secure and undisturbed possession of its own land.—*To the rest* (מְנוּחָה)] *i.e.* to the place of rest: cf. 1 K. 8[56] Ps. 95[11].—**10.** *And he shall give you rest, &c.*] so 25[19] Jos. 23[1], cf. 21[42 (44)] (both D[2]) 2 S. 7[1], cf. v.[11] 1 K. 5[18 (4)]. In all probability the reference is to the peace secured by David and Solomon (2 S. 7[1] 1 K. 5[18 (4)]), v.[11] containing a covert allusion to the Temple in Jerusalem, the city so often described in the Kings (see on v.[5]), in corresponding terms, as "chosen" by Jehovah for His abode.—**11.** See v.[5. 6], from which the expressions used are mostly repeated.—*And all your choice vows*] the expression seems to imply that the vow being something exceptional, the sacrifice offered in fulfilment of it was of a superior kind.—**12.** *And ye shall rejoice before Jehovah your God*] the holy joy with which a sacrificial feast (which is here meant, see v.[7]) is to be celebrated, is elsewhere also the object of a special injunction in Dt. (v.[18] 14[26] 16[11. 14] 26[11] 27[7]; cf. Lev. 23[40] (H) of rejoicing during the Feast of Booths).—*And the Levite*] here the Levite, who has no territorial possession of his own (10[9]), and is accordingly dependent for his subsistence upon what he receives from others, is included also among those who are to be invited to the sacrificial feast (so v.[18] 14[27] 16[11. 14] 26[11]). Cf. v.[19] 14[29] 26[12], which likewise illustrate the Writer's regard for the Levite; and see on 18[1-8].—*That is within your gates*] *i.e.* resident in your various cities. This use of "gates" is peculiarly characteristic of Dt. (see the Introd. § 5), occurring in it some 25 times, and being found besides only Ex. 20[10] ("thy stranger

10-11. והיה . . . ועברתם] AV. "and *when . . . then*"; cf. on 8[19].—**10.** הניח ל] there is a tendency in Heb. for Hif'ils to be construed with ל, apparently as a *dat. commodi*; Gn. 45[7] החיה ל *to give life to*, Ps. 4[2] הרחיב ל *to give width to*, Hos. 10[1] הרבה ל, Is. 53[11] הצדיק ל *to give righteousness to*; cf. Ew. § 282[c], *Lex.* ל **3.**—וישבתם בטח] so 1 S. 12[11] (Deut.), cf. שכן בטח 33[28] (poet.) Pr. 1[33], בטח being an accus. of manner (G-K. § 118. 5); but ישב לבטח is more usual, both in poetry and prose, Lev. 25[18. 19] 26[5] *al.*—**11.** *Lit.* it shall be, *as regards* the place, &c. The accents (which connect המקום with והיה, and separate it from what follows) must be disregarded: המקום is the absolute case, such as occurs constantly after והיה (18[19] 21[3] Nu. 17[20] 21[8b] &c.); *v.* Dr. § 121 *Obs.* 1, 2.—**11.** מבחר] cf. Ex. 15[4] Is. 22[7] 37[24] *al.*

Digitized by Google

that is within thy gates"), 1 K. 8^{37} (Deut.) = 2 Ch. 6^{28}.—**13 f.** The injunction is repeated, with special reference to the *burnt-offering*, as though the temptation to offer this (cf. on v.^{6}) at other places might be peculiarly strong.—**13.** *In every place that thou seest*] and which, by the advantages of its site (cf. v.^{2}), might attract thee to make it a place of sacrifice.—**14.** *All that I am commanding thee*] viz. in the precepts of v.$^{6f. \, 11f.}$.

15–16. Animals, however, that are intended for food, and not for sacrifice, may be slain and eaten freely in any part of the land, provided only that their blood be not consumed.—15. *Thou mayest slaughter* (תזבח)] see below.—*After all the desire of thy soul*] (בְּכָל־אַוַּת נַפְשְׁךָ) v.$^{20. \, 21}$ 18^{6} 1 S. 23^{20} (לְ): אַוָּה besides Hos. 10^{10} Jer. 2^{24}†.—*According to the blessing, &c.*] *i.e.* according as thy means, through God's blessing, permit thee; so 16^{17}.—*The unclean and the clean may eat thereof, as of the gazelle, and as of the hart*] so v.^{22} 15^{22}. On the animals named, see on 14^{5}. The meaning is that animals so slain, even though of a kind that could be offered in sacrifice, might be eaten freely, like game (which was allowed to be eaten as food—see 14^{5}—though not accepted for sacrifice); the meal was not a sacrificial one, and therefore those partaking in it need not even be ceremonially "clean" (Lev. $7^{20f.}$).—**16.** *Only ye shall not eat the blood*] to eat the blood—or "with the blood" (על הדם)—was a practice prohibited to the Hebrews: the antiquity of the feeling against it (cf. in other nations, Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, i. 178 f.) is shown by 1 S. $14^{32. \, 34}$; and it is strictly and repeatedly prohibited in Hebrew legislation,—both in Dt. ($12^{16. \, 23. \, 25}$ 15^{23}), and in the other Codes, viz. (H) Lev. $17^{10\text{-}14}$ (as here, immediately following a law on the place of sacrifice) 19^{26}, and (P) Gn. 9^{4} Lev. 3^{17} $7^{26f.}$ (cf. Ez. 33^{25}). See further on v.^{23}.—The permission expressed in v.^{15} was a necessary consequence of the limitation of all offerings to a single sanctuary. By ancient custom in Israel, slaughter and sacrifice were identical (cf. phil. note, below): the flesh of domestic animals, such as the ox, the

15. תזבח] in old Israel, as stated above, all slaughter was sacrifice; hence זבח naturally expressed not *to slaughter* simply, but *to slaughter for sacrifice*: here, however, though the same word is used, the context shows that it is stripped of its usual associations, and denotes *to slaughter* simply. So. v.^{21} 1 S. 28^{24} 1 K. 19^{21}.

Digitized by Google

sheep, and the goat (as is still the case among the Arabs) was not eaten habitually; when it was eaten, the slaughter of the animal was a sacrificial act, and its flesh could not be lawfully partaken of, unless the fat and blood were first presented at an altar. Compare in this connexion 1 S. 14^{32-35}, where the sin of the people in eating "with the blood" is rectified by the erection of an altar at which the blood can be properly presented to Jehovah: also Hos. $9^{3.4}$ Amos 7^{17}, where it is implied that in exile all the food of the people will be unclean, because sacrifice acceptable to Jehovah cannot be offered beyond the land of Israel, and animals slain for food cannot consequently be presented at an altar (cf. *OTJC.*[2] p. 249 f.). So long as local altars were legal in Canaan (Ex. 20^{24}), domestic animals slain for food in the country districts could be presented at one of them: with the limitation of all sacrifice to a central sanctuary, the old rule had necessarily to be relaxed; a distinction had to be drawn between slaughtering for food and slaughtering for sacrifice; the former was permitted freely in all places (with the one restriction, that the blood, which could no longer be presented at an altar, was still not to be eaten, but to be poured away upon the ground), the latter was prohibited, except at the one sanctuary.

A different view of the ground of the permission in $v.^{15}$ is naturally taken by those who regard Lev. 17^{1-7} as (in its present form) Mosaic. Lev. 17^{1-7} requires every ox, lamb, or goat, slain for food by the Israelites, to be presented at the sanctuary (the "Tent of Meeting"): as this law, though practicable in the wilderness, was evidently impracticable when the people were settled in their homes in different parts of Canaan, Dt. 12^{15} is supposed to be a formal abrogation of it, promulgated immediately before the Israelites' entrance into the Promised Land. This explanation is however inconsistent with the terms of Lev. 17^{7}; how could a law, which from the nature of the case could not continue in force when the journeyings in the wilderness were over, be described ($v.^{7}$) as "a statute for ever unto them throughout their generations," as a statute, that is, intended to be permanently valid? But upon the hypothesis, indicated p. 138, that Lev. 17^{1-7}, in its original form, had reference to a plurality of altars, it falls into its proper place as a law parallel to Ex. 20^{24}, the relaxation of which, as just explained, was a natural corollary of the centralization of sacrifice introduced by Deuteronomy.

17–18. But while flesh, not intended for sacrifice, may be eaten in any part of the land, tithes, firstlings, and other sacred

Digitized by Google

dues may be partaken of only at the central sanctuary. The injunction of v.[7], respecting the place of the sacrificial meal, is repeated here, in more definite and explicit terms, in order to preclude any possible misapplication of the permission granted in v.[15]. On the eating of the tithe, see on 14[22ff.]; on that of the firstlings, 15[20]; on the sacrificial meal accompanying vows and free-will offerings (in so far as these were not burnt-offerings: above on v.[6]), Lev. 7[16f.] (P); the gifts designated by the "heave-offering of thy hand" (v.[6]: cf. 16[10f. 14]) must also, it appears, have afforded occasion for a sacred meal, though the first-fruits (if these are included) were the perquisite of the priests (18[4] 26[2. 4. 10]: comp., however, on 26[11]).—**18.** See on v.[5. 7. 12].—**19.** *The Levite*] the command just given (v.[18]) is repeated, in more general terms, in accordance with the stress which the Writer lays upon it (on v.[12]).

20–28. Repetition of the permission of v.[15], and the restriction of v.[16], with fuller explanations.—20–21. The conditions under which the permission of v.[15] may become necessary, viz. the enlargement of Israel's border, and the consequent remoteness of many parts of the country from the central sanctuary. —**20.** *Shall enlarge thy border, as he hath said* (*promised*) *to thee* (1[21])] cf. 19[8]; and see Ex. 34[24] (JE).—*And thou shalt say, I will eat flesh*] viz. at a feast, or on some other exceptional occasion. "Except at a feast, or to entertain a guest, or in sacrifice before a local shrine, the Bedouin tastes no meat but the flesh of the gazelle or other game. This throws light on Dt. 12[16. 22], which shows that in old Israel game was the only meat not eaten sacrificially. That flesh was not eaten every day even by wealthy people, appears very clearly from Nathan's parable and from the Book of Ruth" (*OTJC.*[2] p. 249*n.*).—

17. לא תוכל] 7[22].—**18.** משלח ידך] *that to which thy hand is put forth*, a kind of compound subst. formed from שלח יד: so Is. 7[25] משלח שור, מרמס שה *that to which* the ox is sent forth, *that which* the sheep tramples down; Is. 11[3] מראה עיניו, משמע אזניו *that which* his eyes see, *that which* his ears hear; [14] משלוח ידם *that upon which* their hand is put forth = their dominion, Ez. 24[25] מחמד עיניהם, משא נפשם *that which* their eyes long for, *that to which* they lift up their soul, Ps. 44[15] מנוד ראש *that at which* the head is shaken, 90[8] מאור פניך *that which* thy face illumines.—**20.** כי תאוה נפשך וג'] "*because* or *when* thy soul," &c. כי expresses here rather more than אם; it enunciates the circumstances (which are conceived to have arrived) under which the action denoted by

Digitized by Google

Because thy soul desireth] the "soul" in Heb. psychology (cf. on v.^{23}) is the *sentient* principle in a living organism, and as such is treated as the organ of feeling or emotion: hence (1) it is used in the higher prose style and in poetry, as a pathetic periphrasis for the personal pron., *e.g.* Gn. 12^{13} $27^{4.19}$ ("that *my soul* may bless thee") Nu. 22^{10} (see RV. *m.*: so Jud. 16^{30} תָּמֹת נַפְשִׁי) Ps. 6^{4} 11^{5} 35^{9} Lev. 26^{43} Is. 1^{14} (שׂנאה נפשי) 42^{1} (רצתה נפשי) 61^{10} 66^{3} Jer. $5^{9.29}$ 6^{8} (notice in the last 8 passages that it is an alternative for the simple pron. in the parallel clause); (2) it is mentioned often as the seat of *desire* (24^{15}) or *appetite* (23^{25}). These two usages explain the employment of the term here (cf. 14^{26}). —**21.** *Have commanded thee*] v.^{15}.—**22.** Repeated, with slight expansion, from v.^{15b}.—**23–25.** A repetition of the injunction not to eat blood (v.^{16}), with a statement of the ground on which it is based, and a motive commending it.—**23.** *Only be firm not to eat, &c.*] lit. "be strong" (חֲזַק), *i.e.* resist firmly the temptation (1 S. 14^{32}) to eat it.—*For the blood is the life* (lit. *the soul*); *and thou shalt not eat the soul with the flesh*] similarly in P, Gn. 9^{4} "only flesh with the soul thereof, even its blood, shall ye not eat"; and in H, Lev. 17^{11} "for the soul of the flesh is in the blood," and hence "the blood atoneth by means of the soul," v.^{14} "for as regards the soul of all flesh, its blood is with its soul (*i.e.* it contains its soul)," and "the soul of all flesh is its blood" (cf. *Hamâsa*, 52^{2}; Wellh. *Arab. Heid.* 217). As the blood flows from a wounded animal, so its life ebbs away; hence the blood was regarded as the seat of the vital principle, or "soul" (Heb. נֶפֶשׁ); in virtue of this it possessed an atoning efficacy (for it contained the pure and innocent life of the animal, which could be accepted by God as a substitute for the sin-stained soul of a man: see Lev. 17^{11}, where it is expressly described as reserved for this purpose); but, further, it was also too sacred to be applied to ordinary human uses, or employed as food: it was to be "poured out on the earth as water," that so the "soul" which it contained might be restored, as directly as possible, to God who gave it.

the principal verb in the sentence takes place (Germ. *indem*); so v.$^{25.28}$ 13^{19} 14^{24} 16^{15} $19^{6.9}$ 21^{9} $28^{2.9.13}$ 30^{10} 31^{29b}.—תאוה נפשך] so 14^{26}. With אִוָּה the use of נפש is idiom.: *v. Lex.*—**22.** יֵאָכֵל את הצבי] G-K. § 121. 1.—**23.** הוא] 3^{22}.

Digitized by Google

See further Oehler, *OT. Theol.* § 127; Schultz, *OT. Theol.* pp. 351–361 [i. 384–396]; Dillm. on Lev. pp. 392 f., 416, 538 f.; Smith, *Rel. Sem.* pp. 215–217, 220, 319–327. Whatever may have been the primitive idea underlying the prohibition—whether it was a mere superstition, or whether it was that the blood, having been once the special share of the deity, was deemed too sacred to be used as ordinary food (Smith, *l.c.* pp. 215 f., 220): among the Hebrews a ground partly physiological, partly theological, as stated above, came ultimately to be assigned for it.—The Heb. *nephesh*, it should be explained, is a wider term than the English "soul," denoting the sentient principle possessed by animals generally; the same phrase "living soul" is thus used, not only of man (Gn. 2^{7}), but also of the humblest marine or terrestrial organisms (Gn. $1^{20.24.30}$ $9^{10.12.15.16}$ Lev. $11^{10.46}$ Ez. 47^{9},—"creature" (AV.), in these passages, being lit. "soul"). See Oehler, *l.c.* § 70; and comp. the Aristotelian idea of ψυχή.

25. *Thou shalt not eat it*] repeated a third time for emphasis, and in order to annex the promise that follows.—*That it may be well, &c.*] the same motive, as 4^{40} $5^{26\,(29)}$ 6^{18}, cf. 5^{16}.—*That which is right, &c.*] 6^{18}.—**26–27.** Nevertheless the permission thus granted is not to be extended to the case of animals slain for sacrifice: the flesh and blood of these must be presented at the central sanctuary, and there disposed of according to the prescribed ritual. A caution, attached to v.$^{20-25}$, just as v.$^{17f.}$ is attached to v.$^{15f.}$.—**26.** *Thy holy things* (קדשיך)] a general designation of sacred gifts, whether such as were dedicated on a special occasion (1 K. 7^{51} 15^{15} 2 K. 12^{19}: cf. 2 S. 8^{11}), or recognized dues, as tithes (26^{13}), sacrifices, &c. (cf. in P, Ex. 28^{38} Lev. $22^{2.3}$ Nu. 18^{8} *al.*). In the Priests' Code, the term has a special sense, being distinguished from the קדשי קדשים, or "most holy things" (see on Lev. 21^{22}); but no account is taken of this distinction here.—*Thy vows*] v.$^{6.11.17}$.—**27.** *Offer*] lit. *do* (ועשית), in a sacrificial sense, as often in P (*e.g.* Ex. $29^{38.39}$); and occasionally besides. There follows a brief description of the ritual of the burnt- and thank-offering (זבחיך: see on v.^{6}), in so far as concerns the disposal of the flesh and the blood: of the former, the flesh and the blood alike are to come upon the altar (strictly the blood of both these offerings was thrown in a volume (זרק) *against* the altar): see on Lev. 1^{5}; of the latter, only the blood is to be poured out against the altar (comp. Lev. $3^{2.8.13}$ וזרקו . . . על המזבח סביב), the flesh is to be eaten, at a sacrificial feast, by the worshipper and his family (Lev. 7^{15-21}).—*Poured out against* (יִשָּׁפֵךְ עַל)] not the technical

Digitized by Google

term, which is זָרַק *to throw in a volume* (cf. מִזְרָק *a bowl*, properly a vessel for *throwing* or *tossing*), 2 K. 16^{15b}, and in P, Lev. $3^{2.8.13}$ and often.—**28.** A closing promise, commending the present injunctions to the Israelite's observance.—*That it may be well, &c.*] v.^{25b}.—*Good and right*] 6^{18}.

29–31. Israel, after it has taken possession of the Promised Land, is not to imitate the unholy rites practised by the previous inhabitants.—29. *When Jehovah thy God shall cut off the nations*] so 19^{1}, cf. Jos. 23^{4} (D²).—*Whither thou goest in, &c.*] cf. on 4^{5}.—*To possess them*] v.².—**30.** *Lest thou be ensnared after them*] cf. $7^{16.25}$.—*And lest thou inquire after* (2 S. 11^{3}) *their gods, saying, How used these nations to serve their gods?*] let the Israelites beware lest, after the occasion of temptation appears to have passed away, the desire arise in their breast to serve the gods of the country with the same rites which their predecessors had observed. The inquiry would be prompted by the feeling, not uncommon in antiquity, that the gods indigenous to a country may not be neglected with impunity (cf. 2 K. 17^{25-28}; 1 S. 26^{19}).—**31.** *Thou shalt not do so to Jehovah thy God*] the rites by which these gods were worshipped are not to be transferred, in whole or in part, to the service of Jehovah. The injunction is aimed against the syncretistic admixture of heathen rites with the service of Jehovah, such as the unspiritual Israelites were specially prone to. The reason follows: the rites in question are of a kind which Jehovah cannot tolerate. For the expressions, cf. 7^{25} $23^{19\,(18)}$ (תועבה); 16^{22b}.—*For even their sons and their daughters do they burn in the fire to their gods*] an extreme example ("for *even*") of the enormities practised by the Canaanites: cf. Jer. 7^{31} 19^{5}, and (of the Sepharvites) 2 K. 17^{31}; and see on 18^{10}.

XIII. 1–19 (AV. XII. 32–XIII. 18). All solicitations to idolatry are to be met at once by the sternest repressive

30. יעבדו] *used* to serve: the impf. as 11^{10}.—גם אני] in the discourses of Dt. the fuller and more emph. form of the 1 pers. pron. is uniformly employed (56 times), except here and 29^{5} (see note). אני here is in accordance with usage, which, when the pron. is appended to a verb for emph., prefers nearly always the lighter form (Jud. 1^{3} 8^{23} 2 S. $18^{2.22}$ &c.: *v. Lex.*, and *JPh.* xi. 223, 226). The other cases of אני in Dt. are $32^{21.39.39.39.39}$ (the Song), and $32^{49.52}$ (P, who prefers אני just as D prefers אנכי: *L.O.T.* p. 127).

Digitized by Google

measures.—The chapter continues the subject of 12[29-31]. In the other Codes there is no parallel. The worship of "other gods" is indeed rigorously proscribed (*e.g.* Ex. 20[3] 22[19 (20)] 23[13]); but no provision is made for the special cases of seduction into idolatry, here contemplated.—**XIII. 1 (XII. 32).** The Heb. division appears to be preferable to the English; for this verse is taken most naturally as a preface to the ordinances following.—*The whole word* (or *thing*) *which I command you, that shall ye observe to do, &c.*] a repetition of 4[2], in a slightly modified form, with particular reference to the three ordinances following.—**2–6 (1–5).** No invitation to go and serve other gods, even though it proceed from a prophet, possessing, as it seems, irrefragable credentials, is to overrule the fundamental article of Israel's creed, that Jehovah is the sole object of the Israelite's reverence: the prophet, who comes forward with such a doctrine, is to be put to death.—**2 (1).** *Arise*] 34[10] 18[15].—*Or a dreamer of dreams*] comp. Jer. 23[25. 27. 28. 32] 27[9] 29[8] Zech. 10[2]. The dream might be the channel of a genuine revelation (Nu. 12[6] Joel 3[1]: cf. Gn. 20[3] 31[11] &c.); but it might readily become a source of self-deception; and in the passages quoted, dreams are referred to, as here, in terms of disparagement.—*And he give to thee a sign or a portent*] viz. in attestation of the truth of his affirmations; comp. Ex. 4[8. 9. 30] 7[9] ("show," lit. *give* תְּנוּ) 1 K. 13[3. 5].—*A sign or a portent*] on 4[34].—**3 (2).** *Come to pass* (בא)] 1 S. 10[7. 9].—*Go after other gods, which thou hast not known*] 6[14]; 11[28].—**4 (3).** *Is putting you to the test* (8[2. 16]) *to know whether you do* (emph.) *love, &c.*] יש always asserts existence with emphasis (*e.g.* Ps. 58[12 (11)] "that there *is* a god judging the earth"): hence הישכם אהבים is more than הַאֹהֲבִים אַתֶּם (which might have been said; see Jud. 2[22]), and is exactly expressed by "whether you *do* love." Jehovah's claim upon the Israelites' love and obedience (6[5]) is a paramount and fundamental principle of their religion: hence the fulfilment of the false prophet's affirmation is a searching test of the sincerity with which Israel holds it.—**5 (4).** *After Jehovah your*

XIII. 1. אתו] resuming emphatically the obj., as Jud. 11[24] Is. 8[13] 2 K. 17[36] (cf. Dr. § 123 *Obs.*).—**2–3.** כי יקום . . . ונתן . . . ובא] on 4[25].—ונָעָבדם] on 5[9].

Digitized by Google

God shall ye walk, &c.] an emphatic reaffirmation of the fundamental duty, binding upon every Israelite: comp. 6^{13} 10^{20}; also 8^{6} 10^{12} $11^{18.22}$.—**6** (**5**). The prophet who has so misled his countrymen is to be put to death, because he has been disloyal to Israel's Divine deliverer, and in order that the evil which he secretly meditates may be checked in the bud.—*Spoken defection* (דִּבֶּר סָרָה) *against Jehovah*] the same expression Jer. 28^{16} (אל) 29^{32} (likewise of untrue prophets), cf. Is. 59^{13}: for סָרָה (*turning aside* [comp. the verb *e.g.* 1 S. 12^{20}], *defection*; AV. *rebellion* or *revolt*), see also 19^{16} Is. 1^{5} 31^{6}.—*Which brought you out, &c.*] cf. 8^{14}; also 7^{8} 9^{26} &c.: here the addition of the two relative clauses emphasizes the fact that defection from Jehovah is also ingratitude.—*To draw thee aside* (לְהַדִּיחֲךָ)] v.$^{11\,(10).\,14\,(13)}$; cf. 4^{19}.—*Out of the way, &c.*] $9^{12.16}$ 11^{28}; also $5^{30\,(33)}$.—*And thou shalt exterminate the evil from thy midst* (ובערת הרע מקרבך)] so 17^{7} 19^{19} 21^{21} $22^{21.24}$ 24^{7}; and with "from Israel" 17^{12} 22^{22} (cf. 19^{13} 21^{9}),—always at the close of instructions for the punishment of a wrong-doer, and always, except 19^{19}, with reference to capital punishment. A formula peculiar to Dt., whereby the duty is laid upon the community of clearing itself from complicity in a crime committed in its midst, and of preventing, as far as possible, an evil example from spreading (cf. the same expression, in Israel's mouth, Jud. 20^{13}).

7–12 (**6–11**). No invitation to idolatry is to be listened to, even though it emanate from a man's most intimate relative, or his most trusted friend: the author of such a proposal is to be put to death.—**7** (**6**). *Entice thee*] with inducements such as an intimate relation or friend can apply (Jud. 1^{14} 1 K. 21^{25}).—*The son of thy mother*] *i.e.* thy own brother (Gn. 27^{29} Ps. 50^{20}): 𝔊 Sam. read בן אביך או בן אמך, including expressly the half-brother (comp. Lev. 18^{9}).—*The wife of thy bosom*] $28^{54.56}$; cf. שֹׁכֶבֶת חֵיקֶךָ Mic. 7^{5}. The term significant of affection is chosen intentionally.—*Thy friend, which is as thine own soul*] 1 S. 18^{1} ("And Jonathan loved him כְּנַפְשׁוֹ") ^{3}.—*Let us go, &c.*] as v.$^{3\,(2)}$.—**8** (**7**). *Of the gods of the peoples, &c.*] 6^{14}.—*Or far off from thee*] the danger therefore might threaten not only from Israel's neighbours (1 K. $11^{5.7}$), but from nations

6. ובערת] for the verb, cf. also $26^{13.14}$ 1 K. 14^{10} 21^{21} 22^{47} 2 K. 23^{24} (Deut.).

Digitized by Google

at a distance (*e.g.* from Syria, or Assyria).—מקצה הארץ ועד קצה הארץ] 28^{64}.—**9–12 (8–11).** The sternest measures must at once be adopted to check the evil: not only is the tempter not to be listened to, but even though the temptation have only been expressed by him in secret (v.^{7}), he is to be treated without mercy or compunction; for his attempt to seduce a brother Israelite from his loyalty to Jehovah, he is to be stoned to death.—**9 (8).** *Neither shall thine eye pity him*] 7^{16}.—**10 (9).** *Thine hand shall be first, &c.*] so 17^{7} (of the witnesses against a man convicted of idolatry): in spite of thy relationship to him, thou art both to denounce him (v.$^{9(8)b}$), and also to be the first to carry out the sentence against him. The severity with which the Writer seeks to check every encouragement to idolatry, shows that he was sensible of it as the pressing danger of the time.—**12 (11).** *And all Israel shall hear and fear*] similarly 17^{13} 19^{20} 21^{21}: the example, the legislator trusts, will have a deterrent effect upon others, and tend to prevent a repetition of the same offence.

13–19 (12–18). Any Israelitish city, which has permitted itself to be seduced into idolatry, is to be treated with the utmost rigour, its inhabitants being put to the sword, its spoil burnt, and its site abandoned.—**13 (12).** *If thou hearest in one of thy cities which Jehovah thy God is giving thee* (1^{20}) *to dwell there, saying, Men have gone forth, &c.*] apparently an inversion for "If thou hearest, saying, In one of thy cities which J. thy God is giving thee to dwell there, men have gone forth, &c.," באחת עריך וג' being brought up from the subordinate into the principal clause (like אחרי מותי 31^{29}, compared by Dillmann), for the purpose of giving it, as the most important part of the sentence, a more emphatic position. For "to hear, saying," cf. Jos. 22^{11} 1 S. 13^{4} 1 K. 16^{16}.—**14 (13).** *Base fellows*] so RV. rightly; comp. the rend. of בליעל in the RV. of 15^{9} Ps. 101^{3} Pr. 6^{12} 16^{27}.

Lit. *sons of unprofitableness*, i.e. *good-for-nothing*, *worthless fellows*. בליעל is not a proper name (in spite of 2 Cor. 6^{15}); though the expression

9. אבה ל] Pr. 1^{30}.—**11.** מעל] idiom. = *from attachment to*: Jer. 2^{5} 32^{40} Ez. 6^{9} 8^{6} 11^{15} 14^{5} $44^{10.15}$, cf. Hos. 9^{1} Is. 56^{3}.—**14.** אנשים בני בליעל] for the seemingly pleonastic אנשים, comp. Gn. 13^{8} Nu. 13^{3} Jud. 18^{7} 1 K.

Digitized by Google

"sons of Belial" has become so naturalized in English that it has been sometimes retained even in RV. Except 15^{9}, the word does not occur besides in the Hex.; but איש (אנשי) בליעל, or בן (בני) בליעל, is common elsewhere as a designation of unprincipled, low-minded characters (*e.g.* Jud. 19^{22} 1 S. 10^{27} 25^{25} 30^{22} 1 K. $21^{10.13}$).

Are gone out from the midst of thee] the suggestion is represented as emanating from native Israelites, who have succeeded in leading astray their fellow-citizens.—*Let us go, &c.*] v. $^{5 (2)}$. $^{7 (6)}$.—**15 (14).** *And, behold, the thing is true* (and) *certain, this abomination hath been done*] the same words in 17^{4}.—*Abomination* (תועבה), of idolatrous practices, as 17^{4} 18^{9} 20^{18} Jer. 32^{35} *al.*: cf. on 7^{26}.—**16 (15).** *With the edge of the sword* (לפי חרב)] lit. *according to the mouth of the sword, i.e.* as the sword can devour (2 S. 2^{26} 11^{25}), without quarter. The phrase is a common one. —*Devoting it*] see on 7^{2}. Devotion to the ban, in which (as here) the spoil also was destroyed, was of the most severe and rigorous type (Jos. 6–7, of Jericho; 1 S. 15^{3}): more commonly the spoil was retained by the Israelites for their own use ($2^{34f.}$ Jos. $8^{2.26f.}$ *al.*).—*And all that is in it*] the expression is an indefinite one; but probably human beings are intended: cf. Jos. 6^{21}, and see below.—**17 (16).** *Into the midst of its broad place*] not its *street*: the רְחֹב was the broad, open space in an Eastern city, something like a modern market-place, where public gatherings were held, and justice was sometimes administered

21^{10} (the same phrase: cf. v.^{13}) 2 K. 2^{16}; used without a defining adjunct, such as a numeral, it imparts to the expression the sense of *some* or *certain*, Gn. 37^{28} (cf. Ex. 16^{20} 1 K. 20^{17b}).—**15.** היטב] 9^{21}.—הנה אמת נכון הדבר] render as above. הנה, as 17^{4} 19^{18} *al.* nearly=*if* (*Lex.* הנה **d**). The second clause (נעשתה וג׳), ἀσυνδέτως, just as 17^{4} 19^{18} (שקר ענה), 22^{20}: *that* in AV., RV., is gratuitous and wrong.—אמת] *faithfulness*, the subst. or pred. (in lieu of the adj. *faithful, true*): so 17^{4}, cf. אמת היה הדבר 22^{20} 1 K. 10^{6} (Dr. § 189. 2).—נכון] lit. *established*: cf. Gn. 41^{32}.—**16.** החרם] on 3^{6}.—ואת כל אשר בה] the expression may denote only the spoil (*i.e.* the domestic property of various kinds), as 20^{14}, or it may include human beings and cattle (Jos. 6^{21}) as well: as the spoil would hardly be "devoted" with the *sword*, it is probably to be understood here of the human beings resident in the city: observe also that the emphatic position of "spoil" in v.$^{17 (16)}$ ואת כל שללה תקבץ implies a tacit contrast with something different which has been named in v.$^{16 (15)}$. It is true, the words ואת בהמתה לפי חרב are not represented in 𝕲; and Dillm. would omit them as a gloss: but the omission makes the verse rather short; and, if כל אשר בה be understood as explained above, there is no difficulty in connecting it with החרם: for החרם לפי חרב of cattle, see Jos. 6^{21}.

Digitized by Google

(cf. 2 Ch. 32^{6} Ezr. 10^{9} Neh. $8^{1.3}$ Is. 59^{14} Job 29^{7}).—*As a whole-offering* (כָּלִיל) *unto Jehovah*] כליל, used of the priest's מנחה, appears elsewhere mostly (33^{10} 1 S. 7^{9} ויעלה עולה כליל ליהוה, Ps. 51^{21} עולה וכליל) as a term either descriptive of, or synonymous with, עֹלָה (burnt-offering): here it is applied figuratively to denote a sacrifice of another kind, the characteristic of which was likewise to be that it should be rendered *wholly* to Jehovah. Cf. Jud. 20^{40} (והנה עלה כְּלִיל העיר השמימה), where the same sense of the word is at least alluded to.—*Unto Jehovah*] comp. Nu. 25^{4} Jos. 6^{17} 2 S. 21^{6}; "before Jehovah" 2 S. 21^{9}. *An heap for ever* (תל עולם)] only a desolate mound shall mark its site; so Jos. 8^{28} (of 'Ai); Jer. 49^{2} תל שממה (of Rabbah).—**18–19 (17–18).** The instructions close with an express injunction that none of the "devoted" spoil (the חֵרֶם) is to be reserved by Israel (cf. $7^{25f.}$), lest Jehovah in His anger be moved to withhold the blessing which He has promised.—**18 (17).** *There shall not cleave aught of the devoted thing to thy hand*] the words may be illustrated from Jos. 6^{18} 7^{1} (though Jericho, of course, did not fall within the class of cases contemplated in the present law).—*Turn from the heat of his anger*] Ex. 32^{12} Jos. 7^{26} (at the close of the narrative of 'Achan's offence with the חֵרֶם), 2 K. 23^{26} Jon. 3^{9}.—*And multiply thee, &c.*] cf. 7^{13}; *v.* Gn. 22^{17} 26^{4} Ex. 32^{13}.—**19 (18).** *Because* (or *when*) *thou shalt hearken, &c.*] the condition, conceived to be satisfied, of the promise taking effect (see phil. note on 12^{20}). For the expressions, cf. $4^{2.\,30b}$ 6^{18}.

XIV. 1–22. *Holiness of the Laity.*

The place of public worship having been fixed (12^{1-28}), and the encroachments of heathendom guarded against (12^{29}–$13^{19\,(18)}$), the subject of the present section follows naturally.

XIV. 1–2. The Israelites, being Jehovah's children, are not to disfigure their persons in passionate or extravagant grief. —The Israelites, being specially dedicated to Jehovah, must not imitate the heathen in yielding to excessive grief, and

17. כליל] כלל occurs as the name of a species of sacrifice in Phœnician, *CIS.* I. i. $165^{3.5.7.9.11}$ 167^{5}.—**18.** למען ישוב . . . ונתן וג'] 4^{1}.—ונתן לך רחמים] Gn. 43^{11} Jer. 42^{12}; Is. 47^{6} (שם).

Digitized by Google

mutilate the body which He has given them, or imprint upon their person the visible tokens of death. The prohibition is grounded upon the relation subsisting between Israel and Jehovah, with which the heathenish character of the practices prohibited is regarded as incompatible. There is no law on this subject in JE or P: in H, Lev. 19^{28a} is parallel.—*Sons are ye to Jehovah your God*] what is affirmed in Ex. $4^{22f.}$ (JE) of Israel as a nation ("Israel is my son, my firstborn") is here transferred to the individual Israelites: they are Jehovah's children; and while on the one hand they are the objects of His paternal care and regard (1^{31} 8^{5}), they owe to Him on the other hand filial love and obedience, they should conform their character to His, and do nothing that is unworthy of the close and intimate relation in which they stand towards Him. Comp. Hos. $11^{1\text{-}4}$ Is. 1^{2}; and on 32^{5}.—*Ye shall not cut yourselves* (לא תתגדדו), *nor make baldness* (קרחה) *between your eyes, for the dead*] two common practices significant of grief, and especially resorted to in mourning, which prevailed among the Israelites down to at least the time of Jeremiah: for the former, see Jer. 16^{6} 41^{5} 47^{5} (among the Philistines), prob. also Hos. 7^{14} (MSS. 𝔊 יתגודדו); for the latter, Am. 8^{10} Is. 3^{24} 15^{2} (in Moab), 22^{12} (where, in spite of the present prohibition, it is said that "*Jehovah* called to weeping, and to mourning, and *to baldness*"), Mic. 1^{16} Jer. 16^{6} Ez. 7^{18}.

Both practices were, and still are, common among semi-civilized races: one or other, if not both, are attested, for instance (see Knob. or Dillm. on Lev. 19^{28}), for the Armenians and Assyrians (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* iii. 1. 13; 3. 67), for the Scythians (Hdt. 4. 71: at the burial of a king τοῦ ὠτὸς ἀποτάμνονται, τρίχας περικείρονται, βραχίονας περιτάμνονται), the Romans (the Twelve Tables forbade the Roman women *genas radere*, Cic. *de Leg.* 2. 23), for the modern Persians (Morier, *Second Journey*, p. 176), and Abyssinians (Rüppell, *Abyss.* ii. 57), for various other savage races (*Encycl. Brit.*^{9} ix. 825; H. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, i. 180 ff., 290 f.). Among the Arabs, it was customary, in particular, for the women, in mourning, both to scratch their faces till the blood flowed, and to shave their hair (Wellh. *Reste Arab. Heidentumes*, p. 160: Labid, xxi. 4 (ed. Huber and Brockelmann) says to his daughters, "When I die, do not scratch your faces, or shave off your hair" (W. R. Smith, MS. note). In some cases, the hair shaved off is deposited in the tomb, or on the funeral pyre, as an offering to the dead; sometimes, also, the blood is made to fall upon the corpse, as though for the purpose of concluding a covenant with the departed (Smith, *Rel. Sem.* pp. 304–306). See further Hastings' *DB.* i. 537–9.

Digitized by Google

Both practices had thus heathen associations, even if they were not definitely connected with heathen superstitions; comp. the use of התגודד to denote the ritual of the Baʿal-worshippers in 1 K. 18^{28}. The custom of lacerating the person in grief for the dead is prohibited also in Lev. 19^{28} (H), though the same term is not used (ושרט לנפש לא תתנו בבשרכם): that of making baldness on the head is forbidden in Lev. 21^{5} (H), but only for the priests.—*Between your eyes*] *i.e.* on the forehead (6^{8}). The Hebrews, it appears, did not on such occasions shave the entire head, but only the front of it.—**2.** The ground of the prohibition is stated more explicitly: Israel is *holy* to Jehovah, and stands towards Him in a unique relation among the peoples of the earth. The verse is an all but verbal repetition of 7^{6}.

3–20. The Israelites are not to defile themselves by eating the flesh of prohibited animals.—JE has no law on this subject; in P the parallel is Lev. $11^{2\text{-}23}$ (not improbably an extract from H: cf. more briefly 20^{25}), a passage with which the law of Dt. is in large measure verbally identical. In order to facilitate comparison, the two passages are here printed side by side in parallel columns:—

Deut. 14.	Lev. 11.
[3] Thou shalt not eat any abominable thing (תּוֹעֵבָה). [4] These are the beasts which ye shall eat:	[2] Speak unto the children of Israel, saying: These are the living things which ye shall eat among all the beasts that are on the earth.
the ox, the sheep, and the goat, [5] the hart, and the gazelle, and the roebuck, and the wild goat, and the addax, and the antelope, and the mountain-sheep.	
[6] And every beast that parteth the hoof and cleaveth the cleft of the two hoofs, that bringeth up the cud among beasts, that ye shall eat.	[3] Every (thing) that parteth the hoof and cleaveth the cleft of the hoofs, that bringeth up the cud among beasts, that ye shall eat.
[7] Nevertheless these ye shall not eat of those that bring up the cud, and of those that part the cleft hoof; the camel,	[4] Nevertheless these ye shall not eat of those that bring up the cud, and of those that part the hoof; the camel, because he bringeth up the cud, but doth not part the hoof; he is unclean to you.
and the hare,	[5] And the rock-

Digitized by Google

and the rock-badger;
because they bring up the cud, but
have not the hoof parted; they are
unclean to you. [8] And the swine,
because he parteth the hoof,
but . .
. . . . . not the cud: he is unclean
to you. Of their flesh ye shall not
eat, and their carcases ye shall not
touch.

[9] These ye shall eat of all that are
in the waters: whatsoever hath
scales and fins,
shall
ye eat. [10] And whatsoever hath not
fins and scales
ye shall not eat;
it is
unclean to you.

[11] Of all clean birds ye may eat.

[12] But this is that of which
ye shall not
eat:
the griffon-vulture, and the bearded
vulture, and the osprey; [13] [and the
. . .,] and the falcon, and the kite
after its kind; [14] and every raven
after its kind; [15] and the ostrich,
and the night-hawk, and the sea-
mew, and the hawk after its kind;
[16] the little owl,
and the great owl, and
the water-hen; [17] and the pelican,
and the carrion-vulture, and the
cormorant; [18] and the stork, and
the heron after its kind, and the
hoopoe, and the bat.

[19] And all winged swarming things
are un-
clean to you: they shall not be eaten.

badger, because he bringeth up the
cud, but parteth not the hoof, he is
unclean to you; [6] and the hare,
because she bringeth up the cud, but
hath not the hoof parted; she is
unclean to you. [7] And the swine,
because he parteth the hoof, and
cleaveth the cleft of the hoof, but he
cheweth not the cud; he is unclean
to you. [8] Of their flesh ye shall not
eat, and their carcases ye shall not
touch: they are unclean to you.

[9] These ye shall eat of all that are
in the waters: whatsoever hath
scales and fins, in the waters, in the
seas, and in the torrents, them shall
ye eat. [10] And whatsoever hath not
fins and scales, in the seas and in
the torrents, of all the swarming
things of the waters, and of all the
living souls that are in the waters,
they are a detestation (שֶׁקֶץ) to you.
[11] And they shall be a detestation to
you: of their flesh ye shall not eat,
and their carcases ye shall have in
detestation. [12] Whatsoever hath not
fins and scales in the waters, it is
a detestation to you.

[13] And these ye shall hold in de-
testation of fowl; they shall not be
eaten; they are a detestation to you:
the griffon-vulture, and the bearded
vulture, and the osprey;
[14] and the kite, and the falcon
after its kind; [15] every raven
after its kind; [16] and the ostrich,
and the night-hawk, and the sea-
mew, and the hawk after its kind;
[17] and the little owl, and the cor-
morant, and the great owl; [18] and
the water-hen, and the pelican,
and the carrion-vulture,
[19] and the stork,
the heron after its kind, and the
hoopoe, and the bat.

[20] All winged swarming things
that go upon all four are a detesta-
tion to you.

Digitized by Google

[20] Of all clean winged things ye may eat.

[21] Yet these ye may eat of all winged swarming things that go upon all four, which have bending legs above their feet to leap withal upon the earth: [22] even these of them ye may eat: the locust after its kind, and the bald locust after its kind, and the cricket after its kind, and the grasshopper after its kind. [23] But all (other) winged swarming things, which have four feet, are a detestation to you.

Here v.^{3} is introductory, the various kinds of prohibited food being classed under the category of *abomination* (תועבה), one of D's characteristic expressions (on 7^{25}). There follow provisions respecting clean and unclean *quadrupeds*, v.$^{4-8}$, *aquatic creatures*, v.$^{9-10}$, *birds*, v.$^{11-18}$, *flying insects*, v.$^{19f.}$. On the general subject of these provisions, the reader is referred to the commentary on Lev. 11: here, only the differences in Dt., or other points of particular interest, will be noticed.—**4^{b}–5.** There is nothing in Lev. corresponding to these words. The difference between the two texts is this, that in Lev. (v.^{3}) the clean animals are only defined, while in Dt. they are both defined (v.^{6}) and exemplified (v.$^{4-5}$). The *ox*, the *sheep*, and the *goat* are, of course, well known, and frequently mentioned; the *hart* (אַיָּל: fem. אַיָּלָה *hind*) is also often named, especially in poetry, as a figure of affection, surefootedness, and rapidity (*e.g.* Is. 35^{6} Song 2^{9}; in the fem. Pr. 5^{19} Ps. 18^{34}); the *gazelle* (צְבִי) is alluded to similarly for its swiftness and beauty (*e.g.* 2 S. 2^{18} Is. 13^{14} Song 2^{9}),—the hart and the gazelle are also mentioned together as common kinds of game, Dt. $12^{15.22}$ 15^{22}. The *roebuck* (יַחְמוּר) is named 1 K. 5^{3} (4^{23})†, by the side of the hart and the gazelle, among the delicacies provided for Solomon's royal table: according to Conder (*Tent Work*, ed. 1887, p. 91), an animal bearing among the Arabs the same name *Yaḥmūr* is found now in the thickets on the sides of Carmel, and gives

XIV. 5. צבי] *gazelle* = Aram. טביא, Arab. ظبى. The word (as Arab. Aram. show) has no etym. connexion with צבי *attractiveness*, *beauty*, the root of which = Aram. צְבָא *to desire*, *will*, Arab. صبا *to incline towards*, *yearn for* (comp. Dr. § 178, p. 225 f.).—יחמר] the etym. is unknown. Arab.

Digitized by Google

its name to a large valley, the *Wady Yaḥmūr*, in the wooded district south of Carmel: a specimen sent to Prof. Newton at Cambridge was pronounced by him to be the true *Cervus capreolus*, or roebuck (*Proc. Zoolog. Soc. of London*, May 2, 1876). Cf. Bochart, *Hieroz.* i. 910 ff., ii. 280 ff. 𝔊 (codd. A, F) βούβαλος. The *wild goat* (אַקּוֹ) is not named elsewhere: 𝔗𝔖 יעל the *ibex* (or *wild goat*), which is common in Palestine (1 S. 24^{3}, near ʿEn-gedi), and some species of which may well be meant (Tristram, *NHB.* 97; *DB.*^{2} i. 1202). 𝔊 (codd. A, F) τραγέλαφος. The *addax* (דִּישֹׁן), also, is named only here; the identification is that of Tristram, who states that the *Antilope addax* is common in Abyssinia, Egypt, and Arabia, and is well known in the ʿArabah, S. of the Dead Sea (*NHB.* 127). 𝔊 πύγαργος (whence AV., RV.), a white-rumped species of antelope (of which there are several), found in N. Africa (*ib.* 126). The *antelope* (תְּאוֹ), Is. 51^{20}†: 𝔊 ὄρυξ, a large kind of antelope, "very beautiful and graceful, with long slender recurved horns" (*ib.* 57 f.; *DB.*^{2} i. 464). The *mountain-sheep* (זֶמֶר) is mentioned only here. The animal meant is uncertain, but some kind of wild mountain-sheep (Col. H. Smith; Tristram, *DB.*^{2} i. 556 f.) may well be intended. 𝔗 ריצא (in Pr. 5^{19} = Heb. יעלה *wild goat*); 𝔖 ארגא *mountain-goat.* 𝔊 καμηλοπάρδαλις, a native of Africa, and not probable. AV., RV. "chamois," which, Tristram objects, cannot be right; as the chamois is an antelope of Central Europe, unknown to any Bible lands.

A singular argument has been founded (Tristram, at the Hull Church Congress, *Guardian*, Oct. 15, 1890, p. 1623; Pal. Expl. Soc., *The City and the Land*, p. 80; and elsewhere) on the animals mentioned in Dt. $14^{4f.}$, in favour of the Mosaic authorship of the Pent. It is said, "Nine animals are mentioned in Dt. which do not appear in Lev. Of these 5 or 6 at least never lived in the Nile valley or in wooded and hilly Palestine: they are inhabitants of desert open plains, or of bare rocky heights. They are not mentioned in Lev., because immediately after the Exodus they would be strange to the Israelites; but after 39 years had been passed in their haunts they would be familiar to them all." A little reflection will show how inconclusive this argument is. Had there been—as the *PEFQuSt.* 1894, p. 103, very inaccurately says there is—a *list* of clean animals in

zamara, to *spring*, quoted by Tristram, does not exist: the meaning is *conjectured* by Ges. in the *Thes.*, merely for the sake of explaining this word.—**6.** אֹתָהּ תאכלו] see on 13^{1}; cf. 20^{20} 1 S. 15^{9b}.

Digitized by Google

Lev., to which in Dt. others, having the character referred to, were added, it would indeed possess plausibility: but that is not the case; no clean animals are *named* in Lev.; they are only defined (Lev. 11^{3}); in Dt. they are *both* defined (v.^{6}) *and* named (v.$^{4f.}$). But, except by assuming what the argument is constructed to prove, there is no reason for supposing that the writer of Lev. 11, if he had been asked to *name* the animals defined by him in v.^{3}, would not have mentioned just those enumerated in Dt. $14^{4f.}$. And the further objection, that the animals in question could not be known to a writer living in Palestine, is open to the retort that, if so, there would be no occasion to forbid the Israelites to eat them. But in view of 1 K. 5^{3} (4^{23}), the allegation itself is questionable.

7. The particulars respecting the *camel*, the *rock-badger*, and the *hare*, which are repeated in each case in Lev., are condensed into a single clause. The שָׁפָן is named besides Ps. 104^{18} Pr. 30^{26}: it is the Arab. *wabr*, the *Hyrax Syriacus* of naturalists. "Rock-badger" is a rendering of the German name *Klippdachs*; but there is, in fact, no perfectly suitable English name available. "Coney" is the old English word for a rabbit; but being now practically obsolete in that sense, it has been retained in RV. as the rendering of the Heb. שפן, the animal which this term properly denotes being indicated in the margin. As the *hyrax syriacus* is in appearance and habits not unlike a rabbit (Tristram, *NHB.* 75 ff.), though belonging to a different family, the retention of "coney" in a popular version may, under the circumstances, be excusable. —**8.** 𝔊 Sam. supply the missing words, reading exactly as in Lev. 11^{7}. Whether the first clause be necessary or not, "he cheweth" must certainly be restored: see below.—**9-10.** The description of the lawful and prohibited aquatic animals seems plainly to be abbreviated from the more circumstantial particulars contained in Lev. In the last clause, Dt. has טָמֵא *unclean*, where Lev. has the technical term, used of prohibited animals (see on 7^{26}), שֶׁקֶץ *detestation.*—**11-18.** The paragraph on birds does not differ materially from the corresponding paragraph in Lev. V.^{11} is an introductory addition: in v.^{12}

7. זה] with a *collective* force: so v.^{9} (=Lev. $11^{4.9}$) Jud. $20^{16.17}$; Job 19^{19}.—קְצָלָה] a rare orthographic variation for קְצָלִי; cf. Gn. 47^{3} רֹעֵה, 1 Ch. 23^{24} עֹשֵׂה (Ew. § 16^{b}).—**8.** וְלֹא גֵרָה] גֵּרָה is elsewhere always a subst.; and יִגָּר (Lev. 11^{7}) is from גרר, not גרה. Read וְלֹא יִגֹּר גֵּרָה, or (cf. Sam. 𝔊) וְהוּא גֵרָה לֹא יִגָּר, as in Lev. יִגָּר will be Qal, in pause either for יִגֹּר (Kön. p. 337 f.), or better (as this is an intrans. form) for יִגֹּר (Sam. יגור), cf. G-K. § 29. $4c^{5}$.

Digitized by Google

the words שִׁקֵּץ and שֶׁקֶץ are avoided, and it is merely said, *Of which ye shall not eat.*—**12.** *The griffon-vulture* (נֶשֶׁר)] not the *eagle*, which, though adequate (in a popular version) as a poetical equivalent of נשר, is not really the bird meant.

As Tristram (*l.c.* p. 172 ff.) shows, the Arab. *nisr*, which corresponds to the Hebrew *nesher*, is not the Eagle, but the Griffon-Vulture, or Great Vulture (distinct from the ordinary, or carrion-vulture, v.[17]), with which also the Biblical allusions to the נשר agree: the eagle, for example, does not congregate around carrion (Job 39[30] Mt. 24[28]), nor has it the neck and head "destitute of true feathers, and either naked, or thinly covered with a powdery down," in agreement with the allusion in Mic. 1[16] ("enlarge thy baldness, as the *nesher*"), whereas both these characteristics suit the Griffon-Vulture. The Griffon-Vulture "is a majestic bird, most abundant and never out of sight, whether on the mountains or the plains of Palestine. Everywhere it is a feature in the sky, as it circles higher and higher, till lost to all but the keenest sight, and then rapidly swoops down again" (*DB.*[2] i. p. 815).

The bearded vulture (פֶּרֶס)] or *Lämmer-geier*, the "largest and most magnificent of the vulture tribe" (*NHB.* 171). *The osprey* (עָזְנִיָּה)] or *short-toed eagle*, "by far the most abundant of all the eagle-tribe in Palestine" (*ib.* 184).—**13.** *And the* . . . (והראה)] Lev. 11[14] has nothing corresponding. The word is certainly a *vox nihili*: see below.—**15.** *The night-hawk* (תַּחְמָס)] or *screech-owl* (*ib.* 191 f.).—*The sea-mew* (שַׁחַף)] or *petrel*, perhaps including gulls (*DB.*[2] i. 679 f.).—**16.** *The water-hen* (תִּנְשֶׁמֶת)] so 𝔊 (πορφυρίων); *NHB.* 249 f. *water-hen* or *ibis*; Knob. *al.*, a

13. והראה ואת האיה והדיה למינה] Lev. 11[14] has ואת הדאה ואת האיה למינה; and so Sam. 𝔊 here. The text of Dt. is certainly corrupt. רָאָה, as the name of a bird, is not otherwise known. הדאה was miswritten הראה: this, being a *vox nihili*, was corrected הדיה (Is. 34[15]) on the margin; and the correction afterwards found its way into the text beside the *corrigendum*. On the form דיה, cf. Ew. § 45[d]; and דויג 1 S. 22[18. 22] for דואג.

15. לְמִינֵהוּ] מין otherwise occurs only in P (16 times in Gn. 1. 6. 7; 7 times in Lev. 11), and Ez. 47[10], 13 of the occurrences in P (Gn. 1[12. 21] *al.*, including the parallel, Lev. 11[16]) being with the same peculiar form of the suffix as here. This form of the suff. occurs besides (with a *sing.* noun) only Jud. 19[24] פילגשהו, Nah. 1[13] מוטהו, Job 25[3] אורהו: Wright, *Compar. Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, p. 155, compares the Aram. מַלְכֵּהּ, and traces both to an ancient genitive form, *malki-hu* or *malki-hi*, the usual form מַלְכּוֹ, מַלְכָּהּ originating in an old accus. *malka-hu* (otherwise Stade, § 345[c]).—מִין] in Palest. Syriac (Payne Smith, col. 2094) *nation*; in the Mishn. *species*, as here; in the Talm. it also means *heretic*, *schismatic*. The root may be the Arab. *māna* (med. *i*), *to split* (the earth, in ploughing): see Fleischer, *NHWB.* iii. 310.

Digitized by Google

species of owl.—**17.** *The carrion-vulture* (הָרָחָמָה)] *NHB.* 179 f.—**19.** *Unclean* again corresponds, as in v.[10], to the שֶׁקֶץ of Lev. By "winged swarming things" (שֶׁרֶץ הָעוֹף) are meant winged insects. שֶׁרֶץ denotes creatures which appear in swarms, whether such as teem in the waters (Gn. 1[20] Lev. 11[10]), or those which swarm on the ground (Gn. 7[21] Lev. 11[41-42] "swarming things that swarm upon the earth"), *i.e.* creeping insects, and reptiles. עוֹף are *flying things* generally, not birds only; hence שֶׁרֶץ הָעוֹף denotes those swarming creatures which also fly, *i.e.* "winged swarming things," or flying insects.—**20.** *Of all clean winged things ye may eat*] unless the verse is to be a mere repetition of v.[11], עוֹף must be understood, not (as in AV., RV.) of "fowls," but in the sense just noticed, of winged insects: it will then correspond to, and be an abbreviation of, Lev. 11[21-22]. The "clean" insects referred to are in particular (as Lev. 11[21-22] shows) certain species of "leaping" locusts (*Saltatoria*)—a group possessing two posterior legs (כְּרָעַיִם, Lev. 11[21]) of great strength and length (shown very distinctly in the illustrations in Tristram, *NHB.* 309, 311), which enable them to move on the ground by leaps, as opposed to the "running" locusts (*Cursoria*), which would fall under the category of "unclean" insects, mentioned in v.[19] (*ib.* 307 ff.). The locusts, permitted in Lev. 11[21-22], are accordingly alluded to in Dt., but not named expressly.

That v.[3-20] is not, as a whole, the *composition* of D, but borrowed by him (with slight additions, as v.[3. 11], and other unessential modifications) from some independent source, cannot be doubted: not only is the general style unlike that of D, but מִין *kind* v.[13. 15. 18] (v.[15] with a peculiar suffix: see below), is a term characteristic of P, and is not likely to have been adopted independently by D. Kuenen (*Hex.* § 14. 5) argues that the provisions, as

17. הָרָחָמָה] with unusual tone (*mil'el*): Lev. has הָרָחָם. The toneless ending ָה is not the mark of the fem. (which always has the tone), but an obsolete accus. (G-K. § 90. 2 R.[a-b]): the *mil'el* tone here may therefore have been intended by the Massorites to preclude the word being treated as a fem., whether on the ground that this would be in conflict with Lev., or that it was improbable that the female bird alone would be prohibited. The Massorites have occasionally done the same elsewhere, partly, as it seems, for the sake of uniformity, as 2 K. 15[29] הַגָּלִ֫ילָה (elsewhere הגליל: the fem. would be הַגָּלִילָ֫ה), Ez. 8[2] חַשְׁמַ֫לָה (1[4] חַשְׁמַל), partly on syntactical grounds, as Hos. 7[4] בֹּ֫עֵרָה, Ez. 7[25] קְ֫פָדָה (the masc. בא follows). Cf. Ew. § 173[b] *note*; Stade, § 308[a].

Digitized by Google

they stand in Lev. 11, are a later and amplified edition of those in Dt. (though he allows that the latter are themselves borrowed from a priestly source): but v.$^{7.\,9\text{-}10.\,12.\,19.\,20}$ wear rather the appearance of being *abridged* from the more circumstantial parallels in Lev.

The point of view under which these prohibitions are here introduced, though not expressly stated, may be inferred from the context (v.$^{2.\,21b}$) to be that of *holiness* (so, explicitly, Lev. $11^{44f.}$ 20^{26}); Israel is a holy people, and is therefore to avoid everything that is "unclean."

The principle, however, determining the line of demarcation between clean animals and unclean, is not stated; and what it is, has been much debated. No single principle, embracing satisfactorily all the cases, seems yet to have been found; and not improbably more principles than one co-operated. Some animals may have been prohibited originally on account of their repulsive appearance or uncleanly habits, others upon sanitary grounds; in other cases, again, the motive of the prohibition may very probably have been a religious one,—particular animals may have been supposed, like the serpent in Arabia (*Rel. Sem.* p. 122; Wellh. *l.c.* 137), to be animated by superhuman or demoniac beings, or they may have had a sacramental significance in the heathen rites of neighbouring nations; and the prohibition may have been intended as a protest against these beliefs. Sacred animals were a common feature in many ancient religions (*Rel. Sem.* 272 ff., 446 ff.); Ez. $8^{10f.}$ mentions the superstitious worship of various creeping things and quadrupeds—described as שֶׁקֶץ "detestations," the same word used in Lev. 11; and Is. $65^{4f.}$ 66^{17} allude to the flesh of the *swine*, the *mouse*, and other "detestations" (again הַשֶּׁקֶץ), as eaten sacramentally (cf. *OTJC.*^{2} p. 366 f.).—Analogous prohibitions are found in many other Eastern lands, as Egypt, India, &c. See further on Lev. 11.

21^{a}. The Israelites are not to eat the flesh of any animal dying of itself.

21^{a}. Ye shall not eat anything *that dieth of itself* (כל־נבלה): thou mayest give it *to the stranger* (גר) that is within thy gates, and he shall eat it, or thou mayest sell it to a foreigner: for thou art a holy people unto Jehovah thy God.

Ex. $22^{31\,(30)}$ (JE). And holy men shall ye be unto me; and flesh in the field *that has been torn of beasts* (טרפה) ye shall not eat; ye shall cast it unto the dogs.

Lev. $17^{15f.}$ (H or P). And every soul which eateth *that which dieth of itself* (נבלה), or *that which is torn of beasts* (טרפה), of the home-born *or of the strangers* (גר)—he shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until the evening; and then he shall be clean. But if he wash them not, nor bathe his flesh, then he shall bear his iniquity.

נְבֵלָה, lit. *a carcase*, is used technically of animals that have died a natural death, without being properly slaughtered: the

21. או מָכֹר] cf. Lev. 25^{14} Nu. 30^{3} (G-K. § 113. 4^{a}).

Digitized by Google

ground upon which their flesh was prohibited being, doubtless, partly because it might be unwholesome, but principally because it would not be thoroughly drained of blood (see on 12^{16}; and note the position of the corresponding law in Lev. $17^{15f.}$, immediately after the prohibition to eat blood, $v.^{11-14}$). The law of Dt., it is evident, is closely related to that of Ex.; it does not, however, directly conflict with it, for the one relates to נְבֵלָה, the other to טְרֵפָה. But it is in conflict with the law of Lev.; for in Dt. what is prohibited to the Israelite is allowed to be given to the "stranger," or foreigner resident in Israel (on 10^{18}), whereas in Lev. it is forbidden to both alike (except under the condition of a subsequent purification); the Israelite and the stranger are thus placed on *different* footings in Dt., they are placed on the *same* footing in Lev. The law of Lev. must certainly therefore belong to a different age from the law of Dt.: the only open question being, which is the earlier?

The difference is in harmony with the distinction which prevails generally, between Dt. and P, as regards the *status* of the *Gêr*. In Dt. the *Gêr* does not stand formally on an equality with Jehovah's people: he is dependent (p. 126) upon the Israelite's forbearance and charity (cf. in H, Lev. $19^{10. 33f.}$); and though some conformity with Israel's religion is expected of him ($29^{10 (11)}$), the only command laid expressly upon him is the observance of the sabbath (5^{14}). In P the *Gêr* is placed practically on the same footing as the native Israelite: he enjoys the same rights (Nu. 35^{15}, cf. Ez. 47^{22}), and is bound by the same laws, whether civil (Lev. 24^{22}), moral and religious (18^{26} 20^{2} 24^{16}, cf. Ez. 14^{7}), or ceremonial (Ex 12^{19} Lev. 16^{29} $17^{8. 10. 12. 13. 15}$ 22^{18} Nu. $15^{14. 26. 30}$ 19^{10}): the principle, "One law shall there be for the home-born and for the stranger," is repeatedly affirmed (Ex. 12^{49} Lev. 24^{22} Nu. 9^{14} $15^{15. 16. 29}$),—the only specified distinctions being that the *Gêr*, if he would keep the Passover, must be circumcised (Ex. 12^{48}), and that an Israelite in servitude with him may be redeemed before the jubile (Lev. $25^{48f.}$), a privilege not granted in the case of the master's being an Israelite ($v.^{40f.}$). Indeed, in P the term is already on the way to assume the later technical sense of προσήλυτος, the foreigner who, being circumcised and observing the law generally, is in full religious communion with Israel (Schürer, *NZg.*² ii. § 31, esp. p. 566 f.). The analogy of other cases makes it probable that the law of Dt. is the earlier, that of P reflecting the greater strictness of a later age, when the *Gêr*, who desired to share the advantages which residence in Israel might offer, must, it was held more strongly than before, subject himself to the same laws. Dillm. is only able to maintain the opposite view (*EL.* p. 540; *NDJ.* pp. 304, 606), by the not very natural supposition that the law of Lev. is part of an *ideal* constitution constructed by P, not, like that of Dt., based upon actual practice,

Digitized by Google

and hence not necessarily the creation of an age subsequent to Dt. Cf. further, Kuenen, *Hibb. Lect.* pp. 182–187; Smend, *AT. Theol.* p. 333; Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäol.* (1894), p. 340 f.; Nowack, *Hebr. Archäol.* § 62.

Foreigner] on 15^{3}.—*An holy people*] v.[2]: the law in v.[21a] is referred to the same general principle as the law in v.[1b].

21ᵇ. A kid not to be seethed in its mother's milk.—This law is repeated *verbatim* from Ex. 23^{19b} 34^{26b}. The prohibition may have been aimed against the practice of using milk thus prepared as a charm for rendering fields and orchards more productive. See more fully on Ex. 23^{19b}.

XIV. 22–29. *Tithes.*

XIV. 22–29. The law of tithe.—Israel is to show its devotion to Jehovah by rendering Him a tithe of all the produce of the soil, to be eaten by the offerer, with his household, at the central sanctuary, at a sacred feast, to which the Levite is to be invited as a guest: those resident at a distance may take with them the value of the tithe in money, and expend it at the sanctuary in such food as they desire, to be consumed similarly at a sacred feast, v.[22-27]. Every third year, however, the tithe is not to be consumed at the central sanctuary, but to be stored up in the Israelite's native place, as a charitable fund for the relief of the landless and the destitute, v.[28-29]. In the legislation of JE there is no mention of tithe. On the relation of Nu. 18^{21-32} Lev. 27^{30-33} (P) to the law of Dt., see p. 169 f.—**22.** *All the increase of thy seed*] the tithe is exacted only on the produce of the soil, in v.[23] corn and wine and oil (7^{13}) being particularized: nothing is said of the tithe of *cattle*, referred to in one passage of P (Lev. 27^{32}).—**23.** This tithe is to be brought to the central sanctuary (as had already been prescribed incidentally in another connexion, $12^{6.11}$), and consumed there at a sacred feast. For the expressions used, see on $12^{5.7}$. From the stress laid, both here and v.[26] $12^{6f.11}$, on this provision, it would seem that the custom had prevailed (cf. Am. 4^{4}) of presenting the tithe at the local sanctuaries.—

22. היוצא השדה] יצא, of plants, as 1 K. 5^{13}; the art. in היוצא shows that השדה is construed not as a gen. but as an accus. (on 8^{14}): cf. יצא את Gn. 44^{4} Ex. $9^{29.33}$.—שנה שנה] G-K. § 123 *d*, 1.

Digitized by Google

The firstlings of thine oxen and of thy sheep] these are mentioned here, only because their disposal was similar to that of the tithe, perhaps also because it was usual to offer them at the same time (Dillm., Keil). The law relating properly to firstlings follows in 15^{19-23}.—*That thou mayest learn to fear, &c.*] cf. 4^{10}. The regular observance of the duties just prescribed is to be the means of keeping alive and exercising the religious feeling of the Israelite.—**24–27.** Facilities granted in the case of the offerer's home being too distant from the central sanctuary to allow of the tithe being conveniently carried there in kind.—**24.** *When Jehovah thy God shall bless thee*] cf. 7^{13}. The difficulty is likely to be the greater, when Jehovah's blessing increases the productiveness of the soil, and augments in consequence the bulk of the tithe.—**26.** *Thy soul desireth . . . asketh*] "soul" is here nearly synonymous with ***appetite***: cf. Nu. 11^{6} (the "soul" dry) Is. 29^{8} (the "soul" empty, and eager for food) 32^{6} Pr. 23^{2} (בַּעַל נֶפֶשׁ lit. "a possessor of a soul," *i.e.* "a man given to appetite"). Comp. on 12^{20} 23^{25}.—*Shalt eat there before Jehovah, and rejoice*] 12^{7}.—**27.** *The Levite that is within thy gates*] the Levites resident in the various cities of Israel (12^{12}) are not to be forgotten on the occasion of sacred festivity (cf. on 12^{12}).—**28–29.** But in every third year—called in 26^{12} the "tithe-year"—a different disposition of the tithe is prescribed: it is to be devoted to the relief of the necessitous in the Israelite's native place.—**28.** *Thou shalt bring forth . . . and deposit within thy gates*] *i.e.* the tithe of the third year is to be "brought forth" from the owner's granaries—the verb may suggest the collateral idea of its being brought forth publicly, cf. הוציא 17^{5} 21^{19} $22^{15.21.24}$ (Dillm.)—and "deposited"—perhaps in some public storehouse—in his native city. *Lay up* (AV., RV.) is an old English expression, often used where we should now rather say *lay down*, or *deposit*: see (also for הִנִּיחַ) Ex. $16^{23.33.34}$ Nu. $17^{22\,(7)}$ 19^{9}.—*All the tithe*] *all*,—as though to guard against the possibility of the tithe in this year being

24. כי ירבה ממך הדרך] 19^{6} כי ירבה הדרך; 1 K. 19^{7} כי רב ממך הדרך; Jos. 9^{13} Is. 57^{10}.—**25.** ונתתה בכסף] give it *for* money (the *Beth pretii*), *i.e.* exchange it for money: not "turn it into (ל)," R.V. So v.[26].—**26.** ואכלת שם] G-K. §§ 49. 3 R.[c]; 20. 2.

in part diverted to other purposes. So 26^{12}.—**29.** *And the Levite, &c., shall come, and they shall eat and be satisfied* (6^{11})] cf. 26^{12} "and they shall eat it *within thy gates*," *i.e.* not at the central sanctuary, but in the various cities in which they dwell. In what manner this was to take place is not stated: it may have been in public feasts provided from time to time by the local authorities, or the tithe thus reserved may have been dispensed in doles to individuals who came and showed that they were in need of a meal. The ordinary tithe was in part (v.^{27}) applied to the maintenance of the landless Levite; the triennial tithe was applied entirely, something in the manner of a poor-rate, to relieve the needs of the landless and destitute classes, whose sufferings so often excite the compassion, or indignation, of the prophets (cf. *OTJC.*^{2} p. 362).—*The stranger, the fatherless, and the widow*] these, not less than the Levite (on 12^{12}), are constantly the objects of the Writer's philanthropic regard: see 10^{18} $16^{11.14}$ $24^{17.19.20.21}$ $26^{12.13}$ 27^{19}: comp. before (in JE) Ex. $22^{20.21\,(21.22)}$, and in H (of the stranger) Lev. $19^{33.34}$; so in the prophets, as Is. 1^{17} Jer. 7^6 22^3 Zech. 7^{10}: comp. allusions to their oppression, Is. 1^{23} 10^2 Jer. 5^{28} Ez. 22^7 Mal. 3^5; also Job 6^{27} 22^9 $24^{3.9}$ $29^{12.13}$ $31^{16.17.21}$.—*That Jehovah may bless thee, &c.*] so 24^{19}, cf. $23^{21\,(20)}$: comp. the same promise on Israel's obedience 7^{13} 15^{18} 28^8 30^{16}; and see on 2^7. The tithe mentioned in these two verses was called by the later Jews מַעְשַׂר עָנִי "the tithe of the poor." The importance attached to it by the legislator appears from $26^{12f.}$, where the Israelite is commanded to acknowledge solemnly before Jehovah the due payment of it. From the subject of the law next following, $15^{1ff.}$, it may be conjectured that this triennial tithe fell due every third and sixth year in each sabbatical period: in the 7th year (in which the land lay fallow) it would naturally not be exacted.

A sacred tithe, especially one exacted on the produce of the soil, was a common institution of antiquity. Of the Greeks, for instance, it is often stated that they rendered a tithe to the gods of spoil taken in war, of the annual crops, of the profits of mines and commercial industries, of confiscated property, &c. (*PRE.*^{2} xvii. 429; Hermann, *Gottesdienstl. Alterth. d. Griechen*,

Digitized by Google

§ 20. 4). Originally the tithe will have been rendered voluntarily, as an expression of gratitude to God, the giver of all good things: and no doubt with religious minds the same feeling will have continued throughout to operate at its payment; but it was often exacted, whether by the priesthood or the community generally, as a fixed impost, payable by the landowners in a particular district, for the purpose of maintaining public worship at a sanctuary. In the East it was moreover not unusual for the revenues of the sovereign to be derived in part from tithes, *e.g.* in Babylonia and Persia (Arist. *Oecon.* pp. 1345[b], 1352[b]): comp. 1 S. 8[15. 17]. The oldest Hebrew legislation (Ex. 21–23) requires the payment of first-fruits (22[28 (29)]), but makes no mention of tithes: it may be either that the scale on which in old times public worship was conducted was not such as to require this impost, or, so far as the Temple at Jerusalem is concerned, that the expenses of its maintenance were defrayed largely out of the king's revenue. The Deuteronomic law of tithe is, however, in serious, and indeed irreconcilable, conflict with the law of P on the same subject. In Nu. 18[21-28] the tithe is appropriated entirely to the maintenance of the priestly tribe, being paid in the first instance to the Levites, who in their turn pay a tenth of what they receive to the priests; in Dt. it is spent partly at sacred feasts (partaken in by the offerer and his household), partly in the relief of the poor,—in both cases the Levite (by which in Dt. are meant the members of the tribe generally, including priests [see on 18[1]]) sharing only in company with others (v.[26f. 29]), as the recipient of the Israelite's benevolence. Further, in Dt. the tithe is exacted only on the *vegetable* produce: in Nu. 18, though it is not expressly so stated, the impression produced by the terms employed (note the similes in v.[27-30]), is that here also only a vegetable tithe is intended: if, however, Lev. 27[32f.] be rightly regarded as an original part of the legislation of P, so that it may be legitimately used in the interpretation of Nu. 18, the tithe levied on the annual increase of *cattle* will be included as well.* But in either case, a large proportion

* Except in so far as it may be included in the "all" of Gn. 28[22], the only other allusion in the OT. to a tithe on cattle is in the late passage

Digitized by Google

of what in Numbers is devoted exclusively to the support of the priestly tribe, remains in Dt. the property of the lay Israelite.

From an early date, endeavours have been made to harmonize this discrepancy. The supposition most commonly made, which is found as early as Tob. 1^{7} (cf. Dt. 26^{12} 𝔊 [see note]), and Jos. *Antiq.* iv. 8. 22, and is adopted generally by Jewish legalists, is that the reference in Dt. is not to the tithe named in Lev.–Nu. at all, but to a *second* or additional tithe, levied (after the deduction of the Levitical tithe) on the remaining nine-tenths of the *vegetable* produce only, and appropriated, not, like the first tithe, to the support of the priestly tribe, but to public feasts celebrated at the sanctuary, and to charity.* It must be frankly owned, however, that this interpretation is not consistent with the language of Dt., or with the terms in which the tithe is there spoken of. Were it the intention of Dt. to introduce a *second* tithe, in the manner supposed, the fact must surely have been indicated expressly by the terms used: it is incredible that a second tithe should have been instituted in Dt. *for the first time*, without a word to indicate

2 Ch. 31^{6} (1 S. 8^{17} referring only to the *secular* tithe, exacted by the king): indeed, even in post-Biblical notices (except in the expanded text [cod. ℵ] of Tob. 1^{6}), including those in Philo and Josephus, there is no reference to such a tithe prior to the treatises of the Mishnah (*c.* 200 A.D.). Lev. 27^{32}, it seems, must represent a claim asserted on the part of the priests, which deviated too widely from prevalent usage to be, as a rule, successfully enforced. It is, however, remarkable that the only express notice of a tithe on cattle in the law should be found, not in the primary and constitutive enactments of Nu. 18 and Dt. 14, but in a chapter (Lev. 27) dealing only with the subordinate subject of the *commutation* of sacred dues; and hence the suspicion may not be ill-founded that Lev. $27^{32f.}$ is a late insertion in P (Baudissin, *Priesterthum*, p. 173; and others. Cf. Nowack, *Hebr. Arch.* ii. 258, *n.* 3).

* The "*third* tithe," of which mention is made in Tob. 1^{8} and in Jos. *Antiq.* iv. 8. 22, is that prescribed in Dt. $14^{28f.}$ (cf. $26^{12f.}$) for payment in the third year, which was held by many of the Jews to be not the same tithe as that of v.$^{22-27}$, differently applied, but an *additional*, or (from their point of view) a "third" tithe, levied triennially for the relief of the poor. This interpretation was, however, not universal even among the Jews: and it is generally allowed by modern commentators (including those who, as Keil, still treat v.$^{22-27}$ as referring to a "second" tithe) to be incorrect; it may thus be taken for granted that the charity-tithe of Dt. $14^{28f.}$ is simply the festival-tithe of v.$^{22-27}$, applied to a different purpose.

Digitized by Google

that it was an innovation, or anything different from what would be ordinarily understood by the word "tithe." The language of $26^{12f.}$, also, makes it exceedingly difficult to suppose that the tithe referred to in Dt. is a "second" tithe: had a tithe been paid regularly every year to the Levites (Nu. $18^{21ff.}$), it is inexplicable that every third year should have been called, κατ' ἐξοχήν, "the year of the tithing"; and when in this same year the whole tithe of the produce has been stored, and the Hebrew makes a solemn profession that it has been properly disposed of by him, it is not less inexplicable that there should be no allusion to his disposition of the first and principal tithe, supposing this to have been really due from him. The two laws, it is impossible to doubt, speak of one and the same tithe; and the discrepancy between them arises simply from the fact that they represent different stages in the history of the institution. The only question remaining open is, which of the two stages is the older? *

Riehm, who holds the legislation of P to be older than that of Dt. (though not, in its existing form, Mosaic), supposes (*HWB.*[1] p. 1793 f.) the custom of spending the tithe upon sacred feasts, of a joyous character, to be an old one, and so firmly established among the people, that the legislation of P failed to supersede it; the legislator of Dt. therefore, abandoning the endeavour to enforce the provisions of P, was content to leave the custom as far as possible as he found it, merely accommodating it to the general scope of his legislation by insisting that these feasts shall only be held at Jerusalem, and by making the institution conducive at the same time to the ends of philanthropy and charity ($14^{27.28\text{-}29}$). Dillmann (on Lev. 27^{33}; and following him, Ryssel in *PRE.*[2] xvii. 442 f.) argues that the tithe being an offering rendered to the Deity, its being paid directly to His ministers would be a more natural and primary disposal of it, than its being appropriated either to a feast, in which the offerer himself would of course retain the lion's share, or (as in every third year) to the relief of the poor. It may have been the custom, he conjectures, for the payment of the tithes to be accompanied by sacred feasts, which P however ignores: the Deuteronomic appropriation of the tithe, in two out of every three years, to such meals exclusively, and only once in three years to the support of the Levites and other destitute persons, is most easily understood as a diversion from its original purpose, introduced at a time when altered circumstances rendered the older system impracticable: the laity,

* That the "second" tithe is no genuine element of Hebrew law, but a harmonistic device of the Jewish legalists, is admitted by the most moderate critics (*e.g.* by Ewald, *Antiq.* p. 346 (E. T. 301) *n.*; Dillm. on Lev. 27^{33}; Riehm, *HWB.*[1] p. 1794^{b}; Ryssel in *PRE.*[2] xvii. 440).

Digitized by Google

when not impelled by genuine religious feeling, would naturally seek as far as possible to relieve themselves of a burdensome impost (comp. Mal. 3^{7-9}; Neh. 13^{10-13}), and would readily acquiesce in an arrangement by which the tithe was reserved largely for their own consumption, but which at the same time was so far in harmony with the spirit of the age that it did not leave the destitute altogether unprovided for.

It may be doubted whether either of these theories is satisfactory. Both, for instance, are open to the objection that they assume a "latent" existence of P for many centuries, during which its provisions remained a dead letter, no attempt to put them in force being made even by the reforming legislation of Dt. Dillmann's theory is open to the further objection, that it does not adequately account either for the prominence given in Dt. to the sacred meal, or for the fact that the third year is called κατ' ἐξοχήν, "the year of tithing." The diversion of the tithe from its original purpose, which the same theory presupposes, is also violent and improbable: if the priesthood, from whatever cause, had been unable to enforce their claims, to which (by the law of P) they were justly entitled, the tithe, it is easy to understand, might have fallen into desuetude altogether; but is the Deuteronomic disposition of it a probable substitute for its original application? and would the legislator have inculcated so earnestly this disposition of the tithe, had it been the case that he was thereby supporting the Israelites in depriving the priestly tribe of its legitimate due?

The data at our disposal do not enable us to write a history of Hebrew tithe: but the disposition of the tithe in Dt. wears the appearance of being more primitive than that of P; and the transition from the prescriptions of Dt. to those of P seems easier to understand than one in the contrary direction. The earliest historical notice of the payment of tithes in Israel is in connexion with the Ephraimite sanctuary of Bethel (Am. 4^4); and the custom of paying tithes here seems in Gn. 28^{22} to be referred to the example of Jacob, the patriarch to whose experiences Bethel owed its sanctity. The tithes paid to ancient sanctuaries were not necessarily appropriated to the maintenance of a priesthood; they might be employed for any purpose connected with the public exercises of religion. In Amos the tithe seems to be mentioned not as a due paid under compulsion to the priests, but by the side of thank-offerings, freewill offerings, and vows, as something offered spontaneously, and forming probably, like these, the occasion of a festal meal at the sanctuary (cf. Riehm, p. 1793^b). To such a practice the law of tithe in Dt. might naturally be understood as attaching itself, though the exact manner in

Digitized by Google

which it may have arisen out of it must remain matter of conjecture.

Prof. Smith (*Rel. Sem.* 226–236) supposes that the tithe-feasts at the Northern sanctuaries were public ones, maintained by the tithes paid by the community generally, and intended for rich and poor alike, but that owing to the power possessed by the great nobles, which they used in aggrandizing themselves (cf. Amos $2^{6.7.8}$ 5^{11} 8^{4-6}), the poor held a very subordinate position at them, and they were monopolized chiefly by the ruling classes. A similar application of the tithe, accompanied by similar abuses, prevailed also, it is not unreasonable to suppose, in Judah. The law of Dt., Prof. Smith thinks, was intended to remedy these abuses. It did this, by leaving the offerer free, in two out of every three years, to organize his tithe-feast himself at the central sanctuary, for his household and the destitute Levite, and in the third year, as a substitute for the abolition of the communal fund (which theoretically maintained a *public* table), by appropriating the tithe entirely to the support of the dependent classes, viz. the landless poor and the landless Levite.

Dt. 26^{12} (cf. Am. 4^{4}*) seems to authorize the inference that some ancient custom, connected with the payment of the tithe, must have led to every third year being called, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the "tithe-year." It may be noticed that it is only in the third year that, according to Dt., the whole tithe is actually paid away by the Israelite; in the other two years it is consumed principally by the offerer and his family. The Levite is specially mentioned as entitled to a share of the tithe in every year; and on the basis of this provision it is not difficult to understand how in process of time the claims of the priestly tribe could be extended until at last (as in the legislation of P) the entire tithe was appropriated to its maintenance, and the sacred feasts disappeared altogether.

The other references to tithe in the OT. are—Gn. 14^{20} 2 Ch. $31^{5.12}$ Neh. $10^{38f.\,(37f.)}$ 12^{44} $13^{5.10-12}$ Mal. 3^{8-10}: cf. also Sir. 32 $(35)^{11}$ Judith 11^{13} (δεκάτας τοῦ οἴνου καὶ τοῦ ἐλαίου), Tob. 5^{14} (codd. BA), 1 Macc. 3^{49}. See further, especially for some account of the minuter regulations contained in the Mishnah, Ryssel, *s.v. Zehnten*, *PRE.*[2] xvii. 428 ff.; also W. R. Smith, *Proph.* 382 f., *Rel. Sem.* 226 ff.

---

* At least, as usually understood ("every three days" an ironical exaggeration of "every three years," as "every morning" of "every year"). But see Wellh. *Die Klein. Proph.* p. 78; Nowack, *Hebr. Arch.* ii. 258; and cf. the writer's note *ad loc.* in *Joel and Amos* (in the *Camb. Bible for Schools*).

Digitized by Google

XV. 1–18. *Three Laws designed to ameliorate the Condition of the Poor.*

XV. 1–6. The year of Release.—Every seventh year is to be a "year of release," *i.e.* a year during which the rights of a lender are to be in abeyance, and repayment of a loan is not to be exacted by him of a brother Israelite, v.$^{1-2}$. This privilege, however, is not to be extended to foreigners, v.^{3}. The law concludes with a promise, v.$^{4-7}$, that in the event of Israel's obedience, the relief afforded by the present law will not be required. On the relation of this law to Ex. $23^{10f.}$ (JE) Lev. 25^{1-7} (H), see p. 177 f.—*At the end of* (every) *seven years*] the word "end," it seems, is not to be pressed, the meaning being, apparently, not "at the end of every seventh year" (though this rendering could be defended by the supposition that it was at the *end* of the year that debts were called in), but "at the end of every period of seven years," which was understood by usage to mean "when the seventh year has arrived" (𝔊 δι' ἑπτὰ ἐτῶν): so 31^{10}; comp. especially Jer. 34^{14}, where "*at the end of* seven years" corresponds to "*in* the seventh year" of Dt. 15^{12}, and where the period thus denoted is plainly conceived to have begun as soon as the six years are terminated. —*Thou shalt make a release* (שְׁמִטָּה)] שָׁמַט is *to fling down* (2 K. 9^{33} שִׁמְטוּהָ), *let drop, let fall*: it is applied fig. Ex. 23^{11} (והשביעית תשמטנה ונטשתה) to *letting* the land *drop*, *i.e.* leaving it uncultivated, every seventh year: comp. Jer. 17^{4} (read prob. יָדְךָ for וּבְךָ) "and thou shalt *let* thy hand *fall* from thy inheritance" (*i.e.* shalt have to desist from its cultivation, with allusion to the law of Ex. 23^{11}): v.^{2} it is applied to *letting* loans *drop*, *i.e.* allowing them to remain in the hands of the debtor; and the year in which this was done is called (v.^{9} 31^{10}†) שְׁנַת הַשְּׁמִטָּה "the year of *dropping*," or "of release." On the question whether the intention of the law is that loans were to be *cancelled*, or whether it is merely that the power of calling them in was to be *suspended* during that year, see p. 179 f.—**2.** The nature of the "release": every creditor is to "let drop," *i.e.* renounce

XV. 2. וזה דבר השמטה] cf. 19^{4} 1 K. 9^{15}, and the Siloam Inscr. l. 1 (*Samuel*, pp. xv, xvi) וזה היה דבר הנקבה; also ... וה הדבר אשר Jos. 5^{4} 1 K. 11^{27}: דבר

Digitized by Google

—whether for the time, or permanently—his claim upon that which he has lent to his neighbour: it is the season of "Jehovah's release," which must be observed with the formalities which He has prescribed. On the constructions in this verse, see below.—*His brother*] a synonym of "his fellow-countryman," which has the effect of bringing strongly before the Israelite the claims of kinship. So. v.$^{3.7.9.11.12}$ 17^{15b} $19^{18.19}$ $22^{1.2.3.4}$ $23^{20.21}$ 25^{3}, and in H, Lev. 19^{17} $25^{25.35.36.39.47}$; but the usage does not occur in the laws of JE or of P. In the pl. the corresponding application is more common, and not so distinctive; comp. *e.g.* 10^{9} $17^{15a.20}$ $18^{15.18}$ $24^{7.14}$ (and often in other books).—*Proclaimed*] by a formal proclamation: cf. Lev. $23^{2.4.37}$ Is. $61^{1.2}$ Jer. 34^{8} 36^{9}; also Lev. 25^{9} (of the jubile year).—*Unto Jehovah*] *i.e.* in His honour, as Ex. $12^{11.14.42}$ Lev. 25^{2}, and often. —**3.** ***A foreigner thou mayest press for payment; but whatsoever of thine is with thy brother, let thine hand release*** (תַּשְׁמֵט יָדֶךָ)] the "foreigner" (*nokhri*)—to be distinguished from the *Gêr* (10^{19}) —is the foreigner who merely visits Canaan temporarily, for trade, &c.: he is not, like the Israelite (Ex. $23^{10f.}$), under the obligation of surrendering the produce of his land every seventh year: there is no reason, therefore, in his case, for any relaxation of his creditor's claims.—**4–6.** Reflections of the Writer. There will, however, be no poor in Israel, and consequently

nearly = the Lat. *ratio, account, nature, reason.*—שמט] the inf. abs. (G-K. § 113. 4^{b}), with the subj. (exceptionally) attached (*ib.* R.): cf. Lev. 6^{7} Ps. 17^{5} Pr. 17^{12}. Construe (with Ges., Schultz, Ke.) "Every possessor of a loan of his hand shall let drop that which he lendeth to his neighbour": for בעל in a forensic application, cf. Ex. 24^{14} בעל דברים = "one who has a cause"; Is. 50^{8} בעל משפטי "my litigant." For מַשָּׁה *loan*, cf. 24^{10} Neh. 5^{7}. The suff. in ידו can hardly refer to anything but בעל: the meaning, therefore, will be "the loan which his own hand has given," and which, therefore, it has a right to call in (v.^{3b}): cf. Neh. 10^{32} וּמַשָּׁא כָל־יָד (see other views in Ges. *Thes.* p. 920 f.).—נָשָׁה ב] 24^{10}; in Qal, 24^{11} *al.*—נגש] prop. *to press hard upon*, by exacting repayment of a loan (so v.^{3}): cf. 2 K. 23^{35} Is. 58^{3}.—קָרָא] the implicit subj. is the cognate ptcp. הַקֹּרֵא, as always in such cases, *e.g.* Gn. 48^{1} ויאמר ליוסף, *sc.* האומר, Is. 8^{4} יִשָּׂא, *sc.* הנושא: see on 1 S. 16^{4}; G-K. § 144. 3^{a} R. Cf. 17^{6}, with note. English idiom often requires a change of form; and the passive voice has to be employed (as RV. here).—**3.** את] *with, in the possession of*: Lev. 5^{23} Jud. 17^{2}.—תַּשְׁמֵט ידך] notice the jussive form. The punctuators prob. intended תשמט to be the 2nd person, "cause thine hand to let drop." But perh. תִּשְׁמֹט "thine hand shall let drop" should be read (cf. v.^{3}).

Digitized by Google

no occasion for the present law to come into operation, if only the nation so comports itself as to merit Jehovah's blessing; then the Israelite, so far from having occasion to borrow of his neighbour, will be in a position to lend to men of other nations. —*Howbeit there shall be no poor in thee* (*for Jehovah will surely bless thee in the land, &c.*), *if only thou diligently hearken, &c.*] so RV., limiting the promise to the event of Israel's obedience, and treating the intermediate clause as parenthetic. This rendering seems to be the best.

Schultz, Keil, and Dillm. render, "Howbeit there *should be* no poor in thee; for Jehovah will surely bless thee, &c., if only thou hearken," &c., supposing the meaning to be either (Schultz, Keil) that Israel should exert itself to prevent the pauperization of its members, or (Dillm.) as expressing the abstract truth that poverty ought not to exist in the nation, if it be obedient, after Jehovah has promised His blessing upon it. But "should be" is not (in this context) a very natural sense of יהיה.

In whatever sense, however, the words are understood, v.$^{7.\,11}$ show that the prospect held out in them is an *ideal* one, which the Writer did not contemplate as likely to be realized in practice.—*In thee*] of Israel collectively (1^{21}) = *in thy midst*: so v.^{7} 7^{14} (Heb.), 18^{10} 23$^{11.\,15\,(10.\,14)}$ 25^{18} 28^{54}. *With thee* (AV.) is not correct: this would express אִתְּךָ (Lev. 25^{39}), not בְּךָ.—*For Jehovah will surely bless thee*] cf. on 2^{7}.—אשר י׳ אלהיך נתן לך נחלה] 4^{21} (cf. ^{38}) 19^{10} 20^{16} 21^{23} 24^{4} 25^{19} (+לרשתה, as here), 26^{1}.—5. אם שמע תשמעו בקול י׳] 28^{1}; in JE, Ex. 15^{26} (לְ) 19^{5} 23^{22}.—*All this commandment, &c.*] on 8^{1}.—6. *Will have blessed thee*] viz. in the case contemplated: so v.^{14} 12^{7}.—*As he spake unto* (1^{11}) *thee*] Ex. 23^{25} Dt. 7^{13}.—*And thou shalt rule over many nations, &c.*] thou shalt enjoy a position of financial and material superiority to them. Cf. 28^{1}.

The law embodies a new application of the institution of

4. אפס כי] *save that, howbeit*, introducing a qualification, Nu. 13^{28} Jud. 4^{9} Am. 9^{8}.—5. רק אם]=*if only*, רק being prefixed to the clause introduced by אם for emphasis. So 1 K. 8^{25} 2 K. 21^{8}.—6. עבט (24^{10}†) is properly *to give a pledge* (*sc.* on the occasion of borrowing), hence *to borrow on pledge*. הֶעֱבִיט (here and v.^{8}†) is thus lit. *to cause to give pledges*=*to lend on pledge to*. Cf. עבוט a *pledge* 24$^{10-13}$†; עבטיט Hb. 2^{6}†. חבל (24$^{6.\,7}$) is the more usual word. Perh. עבט is an Aram. loan-word (Wellh. *Klein. Proph.* p. 207), introduced in commerce: if so, it would=Arab. ضبط *to hold firmly*=Heb. צבט *to hold out* (with the regular phonetic change: Dr. § 178).

Digitized by Google

the fallow year of Ex. $23^{10f.}$ (JE), and of the "Sabbatical year" of Lev. $25^{1-7.\,20-22}$ (H).

The law of Dt. is connected with that of Ex. by the common verb שמט (though in Ex. the object is the land [or its produce], while in Dt. it is the debt); but the name "year of release" is peculiar to Dt. (15^{9} 31^{10}): in Ex. the year bears no special name. The term "sabbatical year" is based upon Lev. $25^{2.\,4.\,5}$ (cf. $26^{34.\,43}$), where the fallow year is called a "sabbath," or rest, for the land. The three laws, as will appear immediately, present different aspects, or applications, of the institution.

In Ex. 23 it is provided that in every seventh year the fields, vineyards, and olive-gardens are to remain uncultivated, such produce as they bear naturally being not gathered by the owners, but left to the poor. The terms of this provision do not leave it perfectly clear whether (as is generally supposed) a year common to the whole land is intended, or (Riehm, *HWB.*[1] p. 1314^{b}; Wellh. *Hist.* p. 117 f.) one varying for the different properties; but even if it be the latter, the year must afterwards have become a fixed one, for in Lev. $25^{1-7.\,20-22}$, where substantially the same regulation is repeated (with variations, chiefly of form, accommodating it to the aims, and literary style, of H), the institution is described as "a sabbath of rest for the land," and is clearly designed to be operative through the whole country simultaneously.

A discussion of the grounds upon which the custom arose of allowing the land to remain untilled once in 7 years belongs more properly to a commentary on Exodus or Leviticus than to one on Deuteronomy: here it must suffice to say that analogous usages in other countries (see Sir H. S. Maine, *Village Communities in the East and West*, pp. 77–99, 107–113, &c.; J. Fenton, *Early Hebrew Life*, 1880, pp. 24–26, 29–32, 64–70) make it probable that it is a relic of communistic agriculture, *i.e.* of a stage of society in which the fields belonging to a village are the property of the villagers collectively, individuals only acquiring the use of a certain portion for a limited period, and the rights of the community being recognized by the individual landowners being obliged, at stated intervals, to renounce their claims to the use, or produce, of the soil, in favour of the body of villagers generally. The "sabbatical year" of Ex. and Lev. is similarly an institution limiting the rights of individual ownership in the interests of the community at large. Such a limitation, it is evident, might readily be adapted so as to minister to the needs of the poorer classes; and this is the point of view under which the institution is regarded in Ex. $23^{10f.}$. The land would at the same time benefit by being allowed to remain periodically uncultivated; and it is this aspect of the institution which is prominent in Lev. 25^{1-7}.

Digitized by Google

In the law of Dt. the same institution is made the basis of a provision designed for the relief of the distressed debtor. In so far as the cultivation of the land was actually suspended during the 7th year, the landowner and his dependents would be deprived largely of their usual means of obtaining a livelihood: associated trades would also probably be slack: hence it would be a time when borrowers would be less able than usually to meet their liabilities; and it would be not more than reasonable that the more wealthy creditor should be restrained from pressing them for payment. The principle of the law of Ex. ("and the poor of thy people shall eat") is thus expanded, and applied so as to meet the requirements of a more developed state of society than that contemplated in Ex. 21–23, its benefits being extended to a class, who, in the more highly organized civic life, and the increasing opposition between rich and poor, which prevailed under Solomon and his successors, were, it may be, even more in need of relief than those originally benefited by the law of Ex. Comp. other laws designed in the interests of debtors, Dt. $23^{20f. (19f.)}$ $24^{10\text{-}13}$.

The present law—or at least the feeling which still prevailed when it originated—dates from a time when commercial relations were much simpler than they are now, and when, it is probable, the system of commercial loans, as practised in modern times, had not yet sprung up, and *all* loans were virtually charitable ones (comp. on $23^{20f.}$). The loans which it contemplates appear thus to be not advances of money, such as might be needed by a trader to enable him to carry on, or extend, his business, but advances intended for the relief of some temporary difficulty or impoverishment (cf. the reference to the poor in v.[4]): no interest could be demanded on them ($23^{20 (19)}$); they fall accordingly, as the context and the terms of v.[4-6] show, under the category of deeds of philanthropy and charity. Whether any security was offered by the debtor for such loans, and if so, what, is not stated: but Neh. $5^{4f.}$ (cf. 2 K. 4^1 Is. 50^1) shows that the lands and family of a debtor might constitute the security for a debt; and Lev. $25^{39.47}$ suggest at least the possibility that (as at Athens before Solon, and in Rome, practically, till the time of Justinian) even the debtor's own person might form the security. The need of protective legislation on the subject is well illustrated by the distressed condition to which the people of Attica were reduced in the 6th cent. B.C., and by the reforming measures which Solon found it necessary to introduce (see Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, Part II. ch. xi., whose comments on the subject of debt in the ancient world are instructive).

Opinions have differed as to whether the שְׁמִטָּה was an

Digitized by Google

actual *remission* of loans, or merely the *suspension*, for one year, of the creditor's right to demand payment. The former interpretation is found as early as Philo, *de septenario*, § 8 (Mangey, ii. 284), κατὰ γοῦν ἕβδομον ἐνιαυτὸν ἀεὶ χρεωκοπίαν εἰσηγεῖται: it is adopted also in the Mishnah (*Shebi'ith* 10, 1), and by Jewish authorities generally, as well as by some Christian scholars (*e.g.* Ges.; Wellh. *Hist.* 117; Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäol.* (1894) p. 350 f.; Nowack, *Hebr. Archäol.* (1894) i. 356); but most modern commentators agree in favour of the latter alternative (Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. 570 f.; Saalschutz, *Mos. Recht*, i. 162 f., Schultz, Knob., Keil, Dillm., Riehm, *HWB.*[1] 1315^b; Oehler, *OT. Theol.* § 151. 10; Orelli in *PRE.*[2] xiii. 168; &c.).

The modern interpretation has all *à priori* considerations in its favour; but we are not, perhaps, sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances which the law was originally designed to meet, or under which it was carried out in practice, to be able to feel perfectly confident that it is correct. The cancelling of debts—χρεῶν ἀποκοπή, as the Greeks called it—was a revolutionary measure (cf. Plato, *Rep.* 566 A, *Legg.* 736 C; Demosth. *c. Timokr.* p. 746), adopted sometimes, as under Solon, at Athens (Grote, *l.c.*), under circumstances of extreme necessity, but not one likely to be enforced periodically by law in a well-ordered community. A law, moreover, contemplating, not to say (v.[9]) encouraging loans, but at the same time cancelling the debts thus contracted every seven years, regardless of the fact that the debtor might in the interim have recovered his prosperity, would seem calculated to defeat itself; for upon such conditions it is difficult to understand how any would have been found ready to lend. The analogy of the landowner surrendering for one year in seven the produce of the land, and of the creditor surrendering, likewise for one year in seven, his claim upon his loan, is also attractive, and appears to offer a plausible *rationale* of the law. On the other hand, the term שמט seems to favour, though not perhaps decisively, the opinion that a *remission* of loans is intended: it is remarkable, also, if the creditor's rights were only suspended for a year, and afterwards resumed, that this is not more distinctly indicated in the terms employed: the consideration in v.[9] is also evidently more forcible upon the same supposition. On the whole, while as a law regulating commercial loans generally it can have been a practicable one only upon the modern interpretation, it is possible that in its original intention its application was so limited by circumstances that the ancient interpretation may be the correct one.

Nevertheless, in view of our imperfect knowledge of Hebrew commerce and finance, it must be admitted that an uncertainty still rests upon the real scope of the law. Others accordingly think that interest on money lent for commercial purposes was permitted between Israelites, and that the prohibition of interest ($23^{20f.}$; cf. Ez. $18^{8.13.17}$ 22^{12} Ps. 15^5) applies only to the money-lender's dealings with the poor (Neh. 5). If this were so,

Digitized by Google

the effect of the present law will have been to prevent the creditor from recovering, in every seventh year, either the interest or the principal of financial loans, or the principal of charitable loans. The analogy of the field suffered to lie fallow for a year is urged in support of this view: the interest, or annual produce (τόκος) of money, corresponds to the harvest, the annual produce of the land: money, like land, was to be unproductive every seventh year. The terms of $23^{20f.}$ Ez. 18^{8} &c. are, however, quite general: can they be limited in the manner proposed? And it is remarkable, if the reference here be primarily to interest, that this is not in some way indicated: the language both of v.[2] and of v.[3] seems naturally to describe merely the loan itself.—The only notice in the OT. bearing on the observance of the law is the obligation undertaken by the Jews in Neh. $10^{32\,(31)}$: (Dt. 15^{2}) וּמַשָּׁא כל יד אח השנה השביעית (Ex. 23^{11}) וְנִטֹּשׁ.

In later times, when commercial relations became more extended and complex, the law, which was then held to apply not merely to charitable loans, but also to loans contracted in commerce, was found impracticable; and expedients were resorted to for the purpose of evading its provisions. Thus debts contracted upon security of a pledge were considered to be exempted from its operation; the debtor, when the year of Release arrived, would offer repayment of his loan, which the creditor, while going through a form of refusal, would end by accepting; and Hillel (1st cent. B.C.), finding that many were deterred from lending by the consideration Dt. 15^{9}, instituted the פרוזבול (προσβολή), *i.e.* a formal document, signed before a judge, in which the creditor reserved the right to call in his loan whenever he pleased, irrespectively of the year of Release (see *Shebi'ith* 10, 1 f.; 3 f., 8 f.,—the latter explained in Geiger, *Lesestücke aus der Mischnah*, pp. 4 f., 77 f.; cf. Levy, *Neuhebr. WB. s.v.* פרוזבול; Schürer, *Nzg.*[2] ii. 299).

7–11. The year of Release is not to check liberality: the Israelite, when called upon to do so, is to assist cheerfully his brother in need.—A caution, rendered necessary, in the Writer's judgment, by the law of v.[1-6]: the benefits afforded by the year of Release are not to be neutralized by the thought of its near approach deterring the wealthy Israelite from coming forward to assist his less prosperous brother in his need. The spirit in which these verses are conceived is in harmony with the philanthropic motive conspicuous elsewhere in Dt. (*e.g.* v.[13f.] $24^{10\text{-}13.\,14f.}$).—**7.** *In thee*] as v.[4].—*In one of thy gates*] *i.e.* in one of thy cities (12^{12}).—*Is giving thee*] 1^{20}.—**9.** *Take heed to thyself*] 4^{9}.—*A base thought*] on $13^{14\,(13)}$.—*Thine*

7. מאחר אחיך] *any one of* thy brethren. For this peculiar use of מן, comp. Lev. 4^{2} if he doeth מאחת מהנה *any one* of these things, Ez. 18^{10} 1 S. 14^{45} משערת ראשו *any* single hair of his head (see *ad loc.*, or *Lex.* מִן **1 b δ**, where an analogous Arab. usage is referred to).—תאמץ] as 2^{30}.—**9.** עם לבבך] on 8^{5}.—בליעל] in appos. with דבר, "a word, baseness"=a base word (Dr. § 189. 1; G-K. § 131. 2[b]).—שנת השבע] cf. Nu. 33^{38} 1 Ch. 26^{31}; and often

Digitized by Google

eye be evil against] *i.e.* be envious or grudging towards: so $28^{54.56}$†. Comp. Tob. 4^{7} (quoted by Ges.) *μὴ φθονεσάτω σου ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν σε ἐλεημοσύνην*.—*And he cry against thee unto Jehovah*] Ex. $22^{22\,(23)}$.—*And it be sin in thee* (והיה בך חטא)] so $23^{22\,(21)}$ 24^{15}, cf. 21^{22}; with *not* $23^{23\,(22)}$. The expression is not found elsewhere. Lev. 19^{17} (cf. 22^{9} Nu. 18^{32}) has ולא תשא עליו חטא.—**10.** *And thine heart shall not be sad*] lit. *be evil* (יֵרַע): so 1 S. 1^{8}; cf. the לֵב רָע (sad heart) of Pr. 25^{20}. It is the correlative of טוֹב (*good*), יִיטַב, טוּב, said also of the heart, and implying cheerfulness: *e.g.* Jud. $19^{6.9}$ 1 S. 25^{36} 2 S. 13^{28} 1 K. 8^{66} Dt. 28^{47} טוּב לֵב.—*Givest*] understood usually (in view of v.$^{1-6}$) as = lendest. But possibly v.$^{7-11}$ is meant generally: the prospect of a reduced income in the near future is not to check the Israelite's liberality towards any who solicit from him pecuniary aid.—*Shall bless thee, &c.*] cf. on 2^{7} 12^{7}. For the thought, cf. Pr. 19^{17} 28^{27}.—**11.** The ground of the preceding injunction: the poor will never cease out of the land, and hence it will never become superfluous.

12–18. The law of slavery.—Hebrew slaves, male or female, unless they elect to remain with their master, are to receive their freedom in the seventh year of service.—The condition of a Hebrew slave, it is probable, was relatively favourable (cf. Ex. $21^{20.26f.}$ Lev. $25^{39f.43.53}$ Dt. 5^{14b} 12^{18} 16^{11}): v.^{16} contemplates the case of his "loving" his master as of likely occurrence; and the law (Ex. 21^{4}) that, if his master gave him a wife, the wife and her children were not to receive their liberty with him, would often act as an inducement to him to renounce his right of freedom after 6 years of service. The present law is based upon the corresponding one in JE (Ex. 21^{2-6}), with parenetic additions (v.$^{13-15.18}$), in the manner of Dt., and with two not unimportant modifications (see on v.$^{12.17}$).

12 If thy brother, *an Hebrew*, or an Hebrewess, be sold unto thee, he *shall serve thee six years; and in the seventh year*, thou shalt send him away *free* from thee. . . .	Ex. 21^{2} If thou buy an Hebrew bondman, *six years shall he serve; and in the seventh year*, he shall go out *free* for nothing. 3-4 If

without the art. (*e.g.* 1 K. 15^{25}).—**10.** בגלל] 1^{37} 18^{12}.—**11.** לְאֶבְיֹנְךָ] "is sing., the ָ being for the purpose of avoiding *shwa'* after the double *yod*" (Dillm.).

	he came in by himself he shall go out by himself, &c. . . . [5] But if the bondman *say*, I *love* my master,
[16] And it shall be, if he *say* unto thee,	my wife, and my children,
I will not go out from thee, because he *loveth* thee, and thy house, because it is well for him with thee; [17] Then thou shalt take *an awl*, and put it into *his ear* and into *the door* (*i.e.* pin them together), and he shall be a bondman to thee *for ever*.	*I will not go out free*, [6] Then his master shall bring him unto God, and he (*or* one) shall bring him to *the door* or to the door-post, and his master shall bore *his ear* with *an awl*, and he shall serve him *for ever*.
And also unto thy *bondwoman* thou shalt do likewise.	[7] And if a man sell his daughter to be a *bondwoman*, she shall not go out as the bondmen do.

12. *Or an Hebrewess*] this addition marks a significant difference from the law of Ex.; for in Ex. (v.[3]), although a woman who comes into service with her husband is to receive her freedom when he does, a daughter sold by her father as a bondwoman is on a different footing, she is not to go free as bondmen do (v.[7]).

Various attempts have been made to harmonize the two laws. Thus one supposition is (1) that the law of Ex. 21[2] is intended tacitly to include women; (2) that the law of Dt. does not abrogate Ex. 21[7], but enforces the extension thus tacitly implied in v.[2]. But the notice of the special case in v.[3], and the law v.[4], that even a female slave married to a bondman, during his period of service, is not to go free with her husband, render it improbable that this tacit extension of Ex. 21[2] can be designed. The addition "or an Hebrewess" in Dt. 15[12] is also a pointed one, which would hardly have been made, unless some material modification of the law of Ex. had been intended by it. According to another supposition (Hengst. *Beiträge*, iii. 439), Ex. 21[7-11] relates only to the case of a woman sold to be a concubine, while Dt. 15[12ff.] contemplates the case of a woman who enters servitude for purposes other than that of concubinage. But the terms of Dt. 15[12. 17] are perfectly general; so that the case of a woman sold for concubinage must be included in them,—unless (which is just the conclusion that the harmonistic supposition is designed to avoid) the law of Dt. belongs to an age so far removed from that of Ex. that the case no longer practically occurred of a woman being sold into slavery for that purpose.

No doubt the true explanation of the variation is that the law of Dt. springs from a more advanced stage of society than

12. ועבדך] Ex. 21[2] makes it probable that the apod. begins here (Dr. § 136 *a*): it *might* begin at ובשביעית, but this would be unusual (*ib.* *Obs.* 1, and § 124).—**14.** אשר ברכך וג׳] אשר=*as*, in cases where it cannot

Digitized by Google

the law of Ex.; it thus regulates usage for an age in which the power of a father over his daughter was no longer so absolute as it had been in more primitive times, and places the two sexes on a position of equality.—Whether any further difference is intended by the substitution of *be sold*, or (as יִמָּכֵר might also be rendered; see Lev. 25^{39}) *selleth himself*, for *buy* is uncertain; taken in its natural sense, the phrase in Ex. would imply that the purchase of a Hebrew slave was a matter of ordinary occurrence: the phrase in Dt. (cf. Lev. 25^{39}) *might* imply that the case was exceptional, and arose only when a man was reduced, by misfortune or other cause, to penury (cf. 2 K. 4^{1}; Is. 50^{1}).—The verse is quoted (slightly varied) in Jer. 34^{14} (cf. v.$^{9.\ 10b}$), upon the occasion of the prophet's rebuking the people for rescinding their agreement to put the law into force under Zedekiah.—**13–15.** The slave at the time of leaving his master's service is to be dealt with handsomely: he is not to be thrown (so to say) penniless upon the world; he is to receive presents of cattle, grain, and wine, according to the prosperity which has attended his master. The regulations in Ex. 21^{3-4} respecting the wife and family of a slave are disregarded in Dt.; and their place is taken by the present provision, which breathes the philanthropic spirit of the Deut. legislation.—**13.** *Thou shalt not send him away empty* (ריקם)] *i.e.* without some present (cf. Gn. 31^{42} 1 S. 6^{3} Job 22^{9}; and on 16^{16}).—**14.** *Thou shalt furnish him liberally*] so the AV. excellently paraphrases the Heb. העניק תעניק לו ‏ עֲנָק is *a necklace* (Jud. 8^{26} Pr. 1^{9} Ct. 4^{9}†); hence עָנַק is *to surround as a necklace* (Ps. 73^{6}), and הֶעֱנִיק לְ *to make a necklace for*, fig. for *to load honourably* or *liberally*.—*From thy threshing-floor, and from thy wine-press*] 16^{13}: cf. 2 K. 6^{27} Hos. 9^{2}.—*As Jehovah thy God hath blessed thee*] cf. 12^{15} 16^{17}.—**15.** The motive for such liberality is to be the thankful recollection of the deliverance from the servitude in Egypt. Similarly (almost in the same words) 16^{12} $24^{18.\ 22}$; also 5^{15} (see note): cf. 10^{19}.—**16–17.** If, however,

properly be rendered *that which* (as Jer. 48^{8} Ps. 106^{34}), which is evidently here not the case, is so doubtful (see on 1 S. 16^{7}; *Lex.* אשר **8 e**) that כאשר should most probably be restored: כ might easily have fallen out after מיקבך, at a time when the final letter had as yet no distinctive form.—**16.** מעמך] v.^{12} 1 S. 14^{17} 18^{13}.—כי אהבך ואת ביתך] on 11^{6}.—כי טוב לו] Nu. 11^{18} Hos.

the slave, through affection for his master, prefer to continue in his service, he may do so; but his servitude must henceforth be for life; and this is to be formally ratified by the ceremony of nailing his ear to the door of his master's house. V.^{16} is slightly varied from Ex. 21^{5}, "because it is well for him with thee" being an explanatory addition, like "and that it may be well for thee" in 5^{16}.—**17.** In Ex. 21^{6} (see above) the slave is to be brought "unto God," *i.e.* to the sanctuary at which judgment is administered, and then led (probably by the judge) to the door or the door-post (whether of the sanctuary, or of his master's house, is not clearly expressed), where the ceremony symbolizing his perpetual servitude is performed by his master. This is the second material modification of the earlier regulations which the law of Dt. contains. In Ex. the ceremony prescribed is a public and official one: in Dt. it is of a purely domestic character, being transacted entirely at the master's own home. It seems that the law of Dt. reflects the usage of a time at which the judicial ceremony, enjoined in Ex., had fallen into disuse, and when the ceremony was performed entirely at the master's house.

It is argued indeed by Keil that this conclusion is a mere *argumentum e silentio*, the legislator in Dt. *meaning*, though he does not say so, the same ceremony as that prescribed in Ex. But the absence of any terms to indicate this, makes the transaction in reality a different one; the argument is consequently more than one *e silentio*; and the Writer of Dt., had he contemplated a ceremony transacted at a sanctuary, would assuredly have felt it incumbent upon him to state (cf. $17^{8f.}$ 19^{17}) at *what* sanctuary it was to take place (comp. Kleinert, pp. 58–59).

A slave for ever (עבד עולם)] 1 S. 27^{12} Job 40^{28} (41^{4}).—*And also unto thy bondwoman thou shalt do likewise*] *i.e.* perform with her, if she elects to remain in servitude, the same ceremony.—**18.** A consolatory thought, addressed to the Israelite, in case the duty of letting his slave go free should seem hard to him. Jer. $34^{8ff.}$ shows how apt the present law was to be disregarded by the Israelites, and how difficult it was to enforce in practice the manumission of slaves required by it.—*To the double of the hire of an hireling hath he served thee six*

2^{9} Jer. $22^{15.16}$; c. 5^{30} 19^{13}.—**17.** את המרצע]=*an* awl (G-K. § 126. 4; or on 1 S. 19^{13}).—ונתתה באזנו ובדלת] the idiom as 1 S. 18^{11} 19^{10}.—ואף] on 2^{11}.

Digitized by Google

years] because, viz. his work has been such that, had a hired labourer been engaged in his stead, he would, at the rate of wages then current, have cost his master twice as much (Schultz).—*Jehovah will bless thee, &c.*] viz. if thou lettest him go cheerfully (cf. v.[10]).

There is a third law of slavery in Lev. 25^{39-46} (H and P). By this law (1) only foreigners are to be held by Israelites as slaves for life; (2) Hebrew slaves are to receive their liberty, not, as in Ex. and Dt., in the 7th year of servitude, but in the year of Jubile. The usual mode of harmonizing these discrepant provisions, is by the assumption that the law of Lev. is intended to provide that, if the Jubile year arrives before a Hebrew slave's 7th year of service, he is to receive his liberty in it. But if this had been the true explanation of the discrepancy, a law so circumstantial as that of Lev. would surely have contained some explicit reference to the earlier law, and the case in which it was intended to supersede it would have been distinctly stated. In point of fact, however, the legislator of Lev. betrays as little consciousness of the law of Ex. (or Dt.) as the legislator of Dt. (if this be the later) betrays of that of Lev. Dillmann supposes that the law of Lev. contemplates the case of those Israelites only who, being completely impoverished, could not maintain themselves in independence, and hence would not be benefited by a release in the 7th year of service, which was not accompanied, as that in the Jubile was, by a return (at least on the part of those who had been landowners) to their hereditary possession. But, since obviously no man would be a slave if he could help it, can it be said that the impoverishment expressed in Lev. 25^{39} is greater than that implied in Ex. 21^{2}? The discrepancy between the laws of Ex., Dt., and the law of Lev. can be satisfactorily explained only by the supposition that the latter is a provision for the mitigation of the servitude of Israelites, designed without reference to the former, and originating at a time when experience had shown (cf. Jer. $34^{11.\,14b-16}$) that the limit of service fixed by Ex. and Dt. could not be enforced. The law of Lev. lengthens the legal period of service, but offers, in some measure, compensation for this by insisting (in phrases borrowed from H) that the Israelite slave is to be treated, whilst in servitude, as humanely as if he were a free man (cf. Riehm, *HWB.*[1] 1503^{a}; Ryle on Neh. 5^{5}; Nowack, *Hebr. Arch.* i. 178 f.). (On the analysis of Lev. 25^{39-46}, see *L.O.T.*[5] p. 526 f.)

XV. 19–23. *Firstlings.*

19–23. The law of firstlings.—The firstling males of oxen and of sheep are to be dedicated to Jehovah, and to be eaten annually by the owner and his household, at a sacrificial feast, at the central sanctuary (v. [19f.]). If, however, the firstling have any blemish, Jehovah cannot accept it in sacrifice; but it may be used by the owner as ordinary food, provided care be taken to eat none of the blood (v.[21-23]). The parallels in the other

Digitized by Google

Codes are Ex. 13^{11-16} $22^{28f. (29f.)}$ $34^{19f.}$ in JE, Ex. 13^{2} Nu. 18^{15-18} (cf. Lev. $27^{26f.}$) in P. In general principle the three Codes agree: but there are some variations in detail; and the disposition of the firstlings, prescribed in v.^{20}, is altogether different from that which is laid down in Nu. 18^{15-18} (see p. 187). The treatment of the subject in Dt. is not exhaustive; nothing is said, for instance (as in both JE and P), of the first-born of men, or of unclean animals: the aim of the Writer is to insist upon the firstlings of the most common domestic animals being presented properly at the central sanctuary, and to provide for the case of such firstlings as could not, on account of some natural defect, be accepted in sacrifice. In the former connexion, the subject has been already noticed incidentally in $12^{6. 17f.}$ 14^{23}.—**19.** *Thou shalt sanctify unto Jehovah*] in agreement with Ex. 13^{2} (P),$^{12. 15}$ (JE), 34^{19} (JE).—**20.** *Thou shalt eat it before Jehovah, &c.*] for the expressions, see on $12^{5. 7}$. From $12^{17f.}$ it would seem that the Levite (as in the case of the tithe-feast, 14^{27}) was to be invited also as a guest.—*Year by year*] in Ex. $22^{29 (30)}$ the firstlings are to be presented to Jehovah on the eighth day from birth ("seven days it shall be with its dam; on the eighth day thou shalt give it to me"); according to the provision here, they are to be presented annually. The change is a necessary corollary of the substitution of a central place of sacrifice (v.^{20}) for the local sanctuaries: the law of Ex. implies that an altar was everywhere near at hand at which the firstlings could be presented on the eighth day. The law of Dt. is an accommodation of the older usage to the institution of annual pilgrimages to the central sanctuary. Most probably the firstlings were offered at the great spring festival, the Passover. For another similar modification of older usage, see on $12^{15f.}$.—**21–23.** *But if there be in it a blemish, &c.*] the general rule that animals offered in sacrifice must be free from defects (17^{1}) is here applied to the special case of the firstlings.—**22–23.** As 12^{15-16}, in the law prescribing how animals, slaughtered merely as food, may be eaten.

In the Priests' Code, an entirely different disposition of the

19. כל הבכור] collect. (on 11^{24}).—**20.** שנה בשנה] idiom. = yearly (1 S. 1^{7} *al.*): cf. *Lex.* ב III. 3 b.—**21.** כל מום רע] a generalizing apposition: cf. on 18^{1}.

Digitized by Google

firstlings is prescribed. Instead of being eaten by the owner and his household at the central sanctuary, they are assigned (Nu. 18^{15-18}) to Aaron (*i.e.* to the priests) with these words (v.[18]): "And their flesh shall be thine; as the wave-breast and the heave-thigh [the parts of the peace-offering which were the perquisite of the priest who offered it, to be eaten by himself and his family, Lev. 7^{34}] it shall be thine."

Two explanations of the discrepancy are offered. According to one (Hengst. *Beiträge*, ii. 406 f.), it is argued that the words in Numbers do not mean that the *whole* of the firstling was the priest's, but only the parts specified in the comparison; the rest, therefore, would belong to the offerer, and might be consumed by him in the manner prescribed in Dt. But the text says distinctly "their flesh" without any limitation; and this solution of the difficulty, though once accepted by Keil (Hävernick, *Einl.*[2] i. 2 (1856), p. 430), was subsequently seen by him to be untenable, and abandoned (*Comm.* on Dt. 12^{6}). According to another explanation, though the firstlings, it is allowed, were given wholly to the priest, he may not, it is supposed, have consumed the flesh of them himself, but may have been at liberty to invite the offerer to share this with him at a sacrificial meal (Keil; Green, *Moses and the Prophets*, p. 84; Bissell, *The Pentateuch*, p. 127 f.). Whether such an invitation, not prescribed, is likely to have been given, may be doubted: it is singular, if this explanation be correct, that Dt. should emphasize so strongly the secondary, rather than the primary, disposition of the firstlings; it is singular also, if it was the intention of the legislation that the offerer, as well as the priest—and as a *duty*—should partake in the firstlings, that, so far from this being at all implied in the terms of the original institution, the firstlings are assigned absolutely, with peculiar emphasis (Nu. 18^{18b}; see v.[11] Lev. 7^{34}), to the priest and his family.

The only consistent solution of the discrepancy is that which we have already had occasion to resort to before (comp. on 14^{29} 15^{18}): the two laws regulate the practice of different periods of the history. Either the law of Numbers is the older, and it must be concluded (Riehm, *HWB.*[1] p. 397 f.) that the priests being unable to maintain their claim to the dues which the law gave them, and the custom having arisen of dedicating the firstlings to Jehovah by consuming them at a sacred feast, the Deut. legislation acquiesced in this custom, making no attempt to reinstate the priests in their rights, and merely providing that the sacred feasts should be held exclusively at the central sanctuary: or the law of Dt. is the older, and it must be supposed that when the revenues of the priesthood were more distinctly and definitely formulated than is the case in Dt. (18^{1-4}), a change of custom had supervened, and the firstlings were now included amongst them (cf. Wellh. *Hist.* 155 f.; W. R. Smith, *OTJC.*[2] 383, *Rel. Sem.* 445). The latter alternative is the preferable one, the change of custom which it implies being in itself more probable than that which is involved in the alternative theory, and also better supported by analogy.

Digitized by Google

XVI. 1–17. *The three annual Pilgrimages.*

The three "Pilgrimages" (חַגִּים), viz. Passover and *Maṣṣoth* (Unleavened Cakes), the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Booths (Ex. 23^{14} שלש רגלים תחג לי בשנה), at which all males were to present themselves at Jehovah's sanctuary (*ib.* v.^{17} שלש פעמים בשנה יראה כל זכורך אל פני האדן יהוה) with appropriate offerings (*ib.* v.^{15} ולא יראו פני ריקם), were one of the principal and most ancient religious institutions of Israel; and each of the great Codes in the Pent. has its regulations respecting them. The oldest and simplest are those contained in JE, viz. Ex. 23^{14-18} $34^{18.\ 20\ end.\ 22-23}$ (generally); 12^{21-27} (Passover), 13^{3-10} (*Maṣṣoth*); next come the regulations in Dt. 16^{1-17}; more elaborate provisions are laid down in Lev. 23 (H and P); the most elaborate of all are those of P, Nu. 28–29 (add, on the Passover and *Maṣṣoth* in particular, Ex. $12^{1-13.\ 14-20.\ 43-49}$ Nu. 9^{1-14}). Lev. 23 and Nu. 28–29 are two priestly Calendars, dealing not only with the three Pilgrimages (חַגִּים), but with other sacred seasons (מוֹעֲדִים) as well (viz. the Sabbath, New Moons, New Year, and Day of Atonement), and prescribing considerably more minutely than is done in either JE or Dt. the details of their observance: the stress in Lev. 23 resting chiefly on the part to be taken in them by the people, and Nu. 28–29 regulating the public sacrifices by which they are to be marked. Of the *mô'ădim*, or sacred seasons, specified in Lev. 23 and Nu. 28–29, New Year's Day, the Day of Atonement, and the New Moons are neither mentioned nor alluded to in Dt.

חַג is usually represented by "feast" in AV., RV.; but this rendering loses sight of a distinctive element in the idea. The חג was not merely a religious festival, such as our Christmas or Easter, but—like the *Ḥaj* (same word), or great annual pilgrimage to Mecca, in which it is the duty of every Moslem, once in his life, to take part—a festival consisting of *a pilgrimage to a sanctuary.* (On the Moḥammedan *Ḥaj*, see esp. Wellh. *Reste Arab. Heidentumes*, pp. 66, 75–89, more briefly the *Enc. Brit.*^{9}, *s.v. Mecca*: the days during which the pilgrims are expected to be present at Mecca, or (more strictly) the sacred spots in the neighbourhood, are the 9th to the 13th of Dhu-lḤijja, the last month of the Moḥammedan year, particular ceremonies being prescribed for each of the five days.) The חג was of a joyous character, being accompanied by music and dances (Is.

Digitized by Google

30^{29} Jud. 21^{19-21}: cf. Lev. 23^{40b}, Dt. $16^{11.\,14.\,15\,end}$). One may be permitted to wonder whether the old Hebrew *Ḥag* was marked also, in any appreciable degree, by the same secular accompaniments—markets and fairs, the formation of friendships and other alliances, displays of poetical talent, the interchange of wit and repartee, &c.—which attended the Arabian *Ḥaj* (see Wellh. pp. 83-86). Only three חגים were observed by the Hebrews, those, viz., mentioned in this chapter of Dt. מוֹעֵד *a fixed* or *stated season* (from יעד *to fix* or *appoint a time*), is a wider term (RV. usually *set feasts*, or *appointed seasons*), and may include (see Lev. 23) the Sabbath, the New Year, and the Day of Atonement. For other examples of *mô'ēd*, see Is. 1^{14} Nu. 10^{10} 15^{3} 29^{39} Ez. 44^{24} 45^{17}; and, more generally, Gn. 1^{14} Ps. 104^{19} (fixed by the movements of the heavenly bodies). In AV. מועד was often rendered "solemn feasts," or "solemn assemblies" (where "solemn" had the sense of the Lat. *solemnis*, *i.e.* "stated"): in the RV. this, being liable in modern English to be misunderstood, has been usually changed, or, if the old rendering has been retained in the text, the true sense has been indicated on the margin (Hos. $2^{13\,(11)}$ Is. 33^{20} Lam. 1^{4} 2^{6}).

The three חַגִּים appear in their origin to have possessed *agricultural* significance: they are an acknowledgment of Jehovah's goodness at the chief seasons of the year, an expression of thankfulness, on the part of the people of the land, to the God Who is its Owner, and Who blesses it with fruitfulness. Passover and *Maṣṣoth*, held in the month of "young ears" (Abib), when the sickle was first put to the corn (Dt. 16^{9}), and accompanied by the presentation of a sheaf of the first ears of barley at the sanctuary (Lev. 23^{9-14} [H]), marked the appearance of the ripening crops in spring; the other two feasts, by the very names which in the older legislation they bear, the Feast of *Harvest*, or of *First-fruits* (Ex. 23^{16}, cf. 34^{12}; also Lev. 23^{15-17} [H], Nu. 28^{26} [P]), and the Feast of *Ingathering* (Ex. 23^{16} 34^{22}; cf. Lev. 23^{39} [H]), mark respectively the completion of the wheat-harvest, and the close of the vintage, when all the agricultural operations of the year are ended (Dt. 16^{13}). In time, however, they acquired in addition a historical significance: the yearly blessings yielded by the soil reminded Israel of the continual goodness of Him who had brought His people out of Egypt, and set them in a fruitful and pleasant land (comp. Dt. 26^{5-10}); and so the feasts, in virtue of the season, or the manner, of their observance, were treated as commemorative of stages of Israel's deliverance. The Passover commemorated the sparing of the firstborn of the Israelites,

Digitized by Google

and the night of the exodus (Ex. 12^{13} P; 12^{27} JE; Dt. $16^{1. 6b}$); *Maṣṣoth*, the Unleavened Cakes made by the Israelites at the time of their flight (Ex. $12^{34. 39}$ JE), and the morning after the exodus (Ex. $13^{3. 8f.}$; $23^{15} = 34^{18}$ JE; Dt. 16^{3}); and the Feast of Booths, the years spent by them in the wilderness (Lev. 23^{43} H). No historical significance is attached in the OT. to the Feast of Weeks; the later Jews, computing, or conjecturing, the date mentioned in Ex. 19^{2} to be 50 days after the exodus, regarded it as commemorating the delivery of the Law on Sinai. Comp. further, on the subject of this section, Nowack, *Heb. Archäol.* §§ 99–100.

The characteristic features in their observance on which Dt. insists are their localization at the central sanctuary, and, in the case of Weeks and Booths, the joyousness and hospitality to be shown at the sacred meals accompanying them. As in other cases, the provisions of Dt. are an amplification of those contained in JE; and in several instances phrases from JE are transferred entire.

XVI. 1–8. The Passover, and Feast of Maṣṣoth.—These are to be observed at their appointed season in the month of Abib: the Passover is to be celebrated, not at the Israelite's own home, or at any local shrine, but only at the central sanctuary; the animal offered is to be wholly consumed on the night on which it is slain; it is to be eaten without leavened bread; and Unleavened Cakes alone are to be eaten during the seven days which follow. In the other Codes, comp. (for the Passover) in JE Ex. 12^{21-27} 23^{18} 34^{25}, in P Ex. $12^{1-13. 43-49}$ Lev. 23^{5} Nu. 9^{1-14} 28^{16}: (for *Maṣṣoth*) in JE Ex. 13^{3-10} 23^{15} 34^{18}, in H Lev. 23^{9-14} (the "wave-sheaf," presented during *Maṣṣoth*), in P Ex. 12^{14-20} Lev. 23^{6-8} Nu. 28^{17-25}. In these Codes, Passover and *Maṣṣoth* are distinct; in Dt. there is a tendency to combine the two institutions, and to treat them as parts of a single whole.—**1.** *Observe* (5^{12}) *the month of Abib*] the month of Abib (*i.e.* the month of the *fresh, young ears*; see Ex. 9^{31} Lev. 2^{14}) is otherwise mentioned only in JE, viz. Ex. 13^{4} and 23^{5} (nearly $= 34^{18}$), each time as the period of the departure from Egypt, and the season for the observance of *Maṣṣoth*. In P, agreeably with the writer's custom to designate the months by

Digitized by Google

numerals, the month in which the Passover was celebrated is termed (Ex. 12² &c.) the "first month" (viz. of the priestly year, as opposed to the ordinary or civil year, which began in the autumn, Ex. 23¹⁶); it corresponds to the post-exilic Nisan (Neh. 2¹ Est. 3⁷†).—*And hold* (ועשית) *the passover unto Jehovah thy God*] עשה פסח (lit. *make*, i.e. *organise, hold*) is a technical expression, used chiefly by priestly writers: 2 K. 23²¹·²²·²³; Ex. 12⁴⁷·⁴⁸ Nu. 9²⁻⁶·¹⁰⁻¹⁴ Jos. 5¹⁰ (all P); 2 Ch. 30¹⁻³·⁵ 35¹·¹⁶⁻¹⁹ Ezr. 6¹⁹†: cf. with *pilgrimage* v.¹⁰·¹³ Ex. 34²² 1 K. 8⁶⁵ Ezr. 3⁴ *al.*; with *sabbath* c. 5¹⁵ Ex. 31¹⁶†.—*For in the month of Abib Jehovah thy God brought thee forth out of Egypt*] Ex. 34¹⁸ "For in the month of Abib thou camest forth out of Egypt."—*By night*] Ex. 12³¹.—**2.** *Thou shalt sacrifice the passover unto Jehovah thy God*, (even) *sheep and oxen*] in P (Ex. 12³⁻⁶) the paschal sacrifice is a *lamb*. The two laws, it is evident, represent the usage of two different stages in the history of the feast: when Dt. was written the victim might be either a bullock or a sheep; when P was written, the choice was limited to a lamb (cf. Nowack, *Hebr. Archäol.* ii. pp. 147, 153, *n.* 1).

The supposition commonly made by harmonists is that the passover alluded to in Dt. is not the "passover" properly so called, but the private sacrifices offered during the 7 days of Maẓẓoth (which immediately followed the night of the Passover), alluded to in the Chronicler's description of the passovers of Hezekiah and Josiah (2 Ch. 30²²⁻²⁴ including *bullocks*; 35⁷⁻⁹ called, in the plural, פְּסָחִים "passovers"), and analogous to the peace-offerings, termed in the Mishnah (*Pesāḥim* 6³·⁴) the *Ḥagigah* (חגיגה), which, at least in later times, it was usual to offer on the same day as the passover, or on the following day (the former were voluntary, the latter were treated as obligatory: Edersheim, *The Temple, its Ministry, &c.* pp. 186 f., 217). But even though the authority of the Chronicler were decisive as to the usage of the age of Hezekiah or Josiah,—for it is his habit to attribute to the period of the kings the ceremonial which was usual in his own days,—this explanation must be regarded as highly questionable: is it credible that in prescribing directions for the observance of an important institution, the Writer should be silent on its central and crucial element, and notice only a subordinate and secondary feature? The opinion that some particular and special sacrifice is the subject of v.², is supported further by the sing. pron. ("with *it*") in v.³.

In the place which Jehovah shall choose, &c.] 12⁵. That the three annual Pilgrimages are to be performed exclusively to the one sanctuary is a point of central importance to the legislator; and the formula expressing it is repeated by him

Digitized by Google

not less than six times (v.$^{2.\,6.\,7.\,11.\,15.\,16}$). The Passover loses consequently, in some degree, its old character (Ex. 12^{21-27} in JE) of a domestic rite.

[3] Thou shalt not eat *leavened bread* with it:	Ex. 23^{18a} Thou shalt not sacrifice the blood of my sacrifice with *leavened bread*.
	Ex. 34^{25a} Thou shalt not slaughter the blood of my sacrifice with *leavened bread*. (Cf. in P Ex. 12^{8}.)
seven days shalt thou eat with it *unleavened cakes*, the bread of affliction: *for* in trepidation *thou camest forth out of* the land of *Egypt*;	Ex. 23^{15} *Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened cakes*, according as I have commanded thee, at the fixed time of the month of Abib; *for* in it *thou camest forth out of Egypt*.
	Ex. 34^{18} *Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened cakes*, &c. (nearly as 23^{15}).
in order that thou mayest *remember* the *day* of *thy coming forth out of* the land of *Egypt* all the days of thy life.	Ex. 13^{3} *Remember* this *day* when ye *came forth out of Egypt* . . . : *leavened bread* shall not be eaten.
	Ex. 13^{6} *Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened cakes;* and on the seventh day shall be a pilgrimage unto Jehovah. [7] *Unleavened cakes* shall be eaten the seven days; and leavened bread shall not be seen by thee,
[4] *And leaven shall not be seen by thee in all thy border seven days:*	*and leaven shall not be seen by thee, in all thy border.* (Cf. in P Ex. $12^{15.\,18-20}$ Lev. 23^{6}.)
and aught of the flesh which thou sacrificest in the evening on the first day	Ex. 23^{18b} And the fat of my feast (חַגִּי) *shall not remain all night* (יָלִין) until *morning*.
shall not remain all night (ילין) *unto the morning*.	Ex. 34^{25b} And the sacrifice of the feast (חַג) of the passover *shall not remain all night* (ילין) *unto the morning*. (Cf. in P Ex. 12^{10} Nu. 9^{12}.)

The prohibition to eat leavened bread either with the Passover, or during the 7 days following, is common to JE, Dt., and P. Leavened bread was forbidden also as the material of any meal-offering (Lev. 2^{11} $6^{10\,(17)}$), the ground of the prohibition no doubt being that, as inducing a species of fermentation, leaven was regarded as a source of putrefaction and corruption (cf. on Ex. 12^{15} 23^{18} Lev. 2^{11}; and *OTJC.*[2] p. 345, *Rel. Sem.* p. 203 f.). Unleavened cakes (מַצּוֹת) alone were, as a rule, presented as offerings (Lev. $2^{4.\,5}$ 8^{2} *al.*). Their use

Digitized by Google

was not, however, confined to sacred purposes; as they could be prepared quickly, they were made in ordinary life when a meal was required speedily (1 S. 28^{14}; cf. Gn. 19^{3} Jud. 16^{19-21}).—*Seven days shalt thou eat with it, &c.*] lit. *upon it* (see below), the whole period of abstinence from leaven being treated as conditioned by the sacrifice of the Passover immediately preceding, and regulated by the same principle established in the first instance for the Passover. As remarked above, the Writer shows a tendency to treat Passover and *Maẓẓoth* in combination.—*The bread of affliction* (לֶחֶם עֹנִי)] so called, because, according to tradition (Ex. $12^{34.39}$ in JE), it was, in the first instance, food prepared by the Israelites, at the close of a long period of servitude, during the anxious moments of a hurried flight: it was accordingly adapted both to remind Israel of the "affliction" (Ex. 3^{7}; cf. 1^{12}) endured by their forefathers in Egypt, and to lead them to a grateful recollection of their deliverance.—*In trepidation* (בְּחִפָּזוֹן)] cf. Ex. 12^{11} (P or H) "ye shall eat it in trepidation"; and the allusion in Is. 52^{12}. "Haste" is not an adequate rendering: the word denotes hurry mingled with alarm; cf. the verb in Dt. 20^{3} 1 S. 23^{26} 2 S. 4^{4} Ps. $48^{6(5)}$.—*All the days of thy life*] 4^{9} 6^{2}.

5–7. The principle is again emphasized that the Passover is not to be sacrificed at the Israelite's own home, but at the sanctuary chosen by Jehovah.—*Within any of the gates*] 15^{7}.—**6.** *In the evening*] the technical phrase used by P is "between the two evenings"; see on Ex. 12^{6}.—כבוא השמש] 23^{12} 24^{13} Jos. 8^{29} (D^2) 1 K. 25^{36}†.—*At the fixed time* (מועד) *of thy coming forth from Egypt*] the "fixed time" (Ex. 9^{5} 1 S. 9^{24} 13^{8}) of the departure from Egypt determines the hour of its annual commemoration by the Passover. מועד denotes here not the period in the month (Ex. 13^{10} 23^{15}), but the hour of the day, at which the Passover was to be kept.—**7.** *And thou shalt boil*] or perhaps *cook*. בשל means regularly to *boil* (14^{21} 1 S. $2^{13.15}$

XVI. 3. עליו] *upon* it=*with* it, used idiomatically with אכל, as in אכל על הדם Lev. 19^{26} 1 S. 14^{32} *al.*, Ex. 12^{8} על מרדים יאכלהו, 23^{18} 34^{25} *al.*—**4.** לך] with the passive verb=*by*: Gn. 31^{15} Ex. 12^{16} 1 S. 2^{3} Is. 65^{1} (*Lex.* ל **5 d**).—**5.** לא תוכל] as 7^{22}.—**7.** ובשלת] cf. also Nowack, *Hebr. Arch.* ii. 153, *n.* 3. 𝔊 (καὶ ἑψήσεις καὶ ὀπτήσεις) exhibits side by side the original translation, and the correction in accordance with Ex. 12^{9}.

&c.): hence it is difficult to feel assured that it can be fairly translated otherwise here; and it is in any case remarkable that the term employed in Dt. is the one which is used in P (Ex. 12^{9}) to denote the process that is *not* to be applied to the paschal sacrifice ("eat not of it raw, or *boiled in water* (בָּשֵׁל מְבֻשָּׁל בַּמָּיִם), but roast with fire"). Still בשל does not in itself, it seems, express more than *to mature* or *make fit for eating* (hence, of fruit or corn, *to ripen*, Gn. 40^{10} Joel 4^{13}), and at least in 2 Ch. 35^{13} (at a time when it is reasonable to suppose that the law of Ex. 12^{9} was in operation, and the Passover consequently roasted) בִּשֵּׁל בָּאֵשׁ is used of the Passover (ויבשלו הפסח באש כמשפט): it is possible therefore that, though generally applied to boiling, it may have possessed the wider, more general sense of cooking, and may thus have been applicable to what, properly speaking, was roasted. But the case is one in which it is difficult to speak confidently; in view of Ex. 12^{9}, it must be admitted that a different usage may here be prescribed, belonging to an age when the Passover was not *roast* (צְלִי אֵשׁ), but "boiled."—*Thou shalt turn in the morning, and go to thy tents*] the Israelite is at liberty to return home, on the morning after the Passover has been eaten.—*Turn* (פנה, not שוב) is rather a favourite word with D (on 3^{1}).—*To thy tents*] *i.e.* to thy home. The expression is a survival from the time when Israel was a nomadic people, and actually lived in tents; it remained in use long after the "tents" had given place to permanent "houses" (see *e.g.* Jud. 7^{8} 19^{9} 1 S. 13^{2} 2 S. 19^{9} 20^{22} 1 K. 12^{16}).

8 Six *days shalt thou eat unleavened cakes; and on the seventh day shall be a* solemn assembly (*'aṣéreth*) *to Jehovah* thy God; thou shalt not do work.	Ex. 13^{6} (JE) Seven *days shalt thou eat unleavened cakes; and on the seventh day shall be a* pilgrimage (*ḥag*) *to Jehovah.*

The six days meant are the first six of the seven specified in v.^{3}. The seventh day is to be marked by a religious gathering, and abstention from labour. In JE the first day is particularized as specially commemorating the Exodus (Ex. $13^{3f.}$); but the seventh day (though nothing is said respecting abstention from work) appears, as in Dt., to be the principal day of the feast: it is marked, viz., by a *ḥag* to Jehovah. If *ḥag*

Digitized by Google

has here its proper sense of *pilgrimage*, it must be supposed (Riehm, *HWB.*^{1} 432^{a}; Dillm. on Ex. 13^{6}) that this is assigned to the seventh day of the feast, on account of many of the pilgrims, at a time when the Passover was celebrated as a *domestic* rite, being only able to reach the sanctuary towards the close of the seven days of *Maṣṣoth*: possibly, however, *ḥag* denotes here a festal gathering of pilgrims (analogous to the *'aṣéreth* of Dt.). In P the first is represented as the principal day (Ex. 12^{14}, cf. Lev. 23^{6} Nu. 28^{17}); and a "holy convocation" (מקרא קרש) is appointed both for that and for the seventh day (Ex. 12^{16} Lev. $23^{7.8}$ Nu. $28^{18.25}$), all work, except the preparation of food, being forbidden on both. The differences between the three representations are not very important: that of P, being the stricter and the more precise, has the presumption of being the later (Delitzsch in Riehm, *HWB.*^{1} 1142^{a}).

עֲצֶרֶת (or עֲצָרָה) means *a gathering* or *assembly* (Jer. $9^{1\,(2)}$), from עצר *to hold in, confine, enclose*, esp. one held for a religious purpose, πανήγυρις, as 2 K. 10^{20} (in honour of Ba'al), Is. 1^{13} Joel 1^{14} 2^{15} (all עצרה), Am. 5^{21}: used specially (*a*) of the gathering of pilgrims on the eighth or supernumerary day of the Feast of Booths, Lev. 23^{36} Nu. 29^{35} (both P) Neh. 8^{18} 2 Ch. 7^{9}†; (*b*) in the present passage, of the gathering on the seventh day of *Maṣṣoth* (not so elsewhere); (*c*) by the later Jews, of the Feast of Weeks, Jos. *Ant.* iii. 10. 6 (Ἄσαρθα), in the Mishnah, *Ḥagigah*, ii. 4, &c., Nu. 28^{26} 𝔗, and in the Talm. (Levy, *Chald. Lex. s.v.* עֲצַרְתָּא). The עצרת mentioned here, as also that at the Feast of Booths, was held as a fact on the last day of the festival; but the etymology implied in the rendering "closing festival" (Lev. 23^{36} RV. *marg.*; cf. 𝔊 ἐξόδιον) is not a probable one, on account of the more general meaning which the word has (see esp. Jer. $9^{1\,(2)}$).

Thou shalt not do work (לא תעשה מלאכה)] similarly Ex. 12^{16} (כל מלאכה לא יֵעָשֶׂה) in P. The phrase עשה מלאכה *to do work* or *business* is a common one (*e.g.* Jud. 16^{11} 2 K. $22^{5.9}$); in the prohibition respecting the Sabbath, Ex. 20^{10} $31^{14.15}$ *al.*, and other sacred seasons, Lev. 16^{29} 23^{31} *al.*

9–12. The Feast of Weeks.—In the other Codes, the references to this feast are—in JE, Ex. 23^{16} 34^{22}; in H (with additions from P in v.$^{18.19.20}$), Lev. 23^{15-20} (the two loaves to be presented to Jehovah, prepared with leaven, and implying, in contrast to the barley-sheaf, offered during *Maṣṣoth*, the completion of the year's harvest); in P, Lev. 23^{21} Nu. 28^{26-31}. The name "Feast of Weeks" (v.$^{10.16}$) agrees with Ex. 34^{22} 2 Ch.

Digitized by Google

8^{13} (cf. Nu. 28^{26} בְּשָׁבֻעֹתֵיכֶם): in Ex. 23^{16} it is called the "Feast of Harvest" (חג הקציר); and in Nu. 28^{26} the "Day of First-fruits" (יום הבכורים). In making no allusion to the firstfruits, Dt. differs from all the other Codes; in the calculation which it prescribes for fixing the date of the festival (which in Ex. 23^{16} is left undetermined, and in Ex. 34^{22} is simply presupposed by the use of the term "weeks") it agrees with Lev. $23^{15f.}$ (except that there, instead of the beginning of harvest, which might vary from year to year, a particular day is specified as that from which the computation is to commence); in the emphasis laid upon the social meals, and the feelings with which they should be attended, it manifests the same interests which predominate in Dt. elsewhere.—**9.** *Seven weeks shalt thou number unto thee: from the beginning of the sickle in the standing-corn shalt thou begin to number seven weeks*] cf. Lev. 23^{15} (H) "And ye shall number unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye bring the wave-sheaf [mentioned v.[11]]: seven sabbaths shall there be complete": the more precise date follows in the next verse, חמשים יום (whence the Rabb. name of the Festival, יום חמשים יום, NT. πεντηκοστή).

[10] And thou shalt *hold* (עשית) *the Pilgrimage of Weeks* unto Jehovah thy God.

Ex. 34^{22} (JE) And *the Pilgrimage of Weeks* thou shalt *hold* thee (תעשה לך), the firstfruits of wheat-harvest.
Ex. 23^{16} And the Pilgrimage of harvest, the firstfruits of thy labours, which thou sowest in the field.

Hold] v.[1].—*After the measure of the free-will offering of thine hand* (12^{6}), *which thou shalt give; according as Jehovah thy God shall bless thee*] the offering which each is to make is to be fixed by himself, according to the degree in which Jehovah has blessed him in the year's harvest (cf. v.[17], where the same rule is extended to the other two feasts). On the word rendered *measure*, see below.—**11.** *And thou shalt rejoice, &c.*] for the expressions, see $12^{7.12}$ ("the Levite") [18] 14^{29} ("the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow").—**12.** The motive for such hospitality towards the poor, as before (15^{15})

9. תספר לך] so v.[13. 18. 21. 22] (on 1^{13}).—**10.** מִסַּת] only here in Heb.: in Aram. common in the sense of *sufficiency*, and as adv. acc. =*pro ratione, according to: e.g.* Ob.[5] 𝕿𝕾 (=Heb. דַּי); Dt. 15^{8} 𝕿 כְּמִסַּת (=דֵּי), Ex. 12^{4} 16^{21} 𝕾(=לפי).

Digitized by Google

towards the manumitted slave: the recollection, viz., of the bondage in Egypt, from which, by Jehovah's mercy, Israel's forefathers had been redeemed.

13–15. The Feast of Booths.—In the other Codes, comp. (JE) Ex. 23^{16} 34^{22}; (H) Lev. $23^{39b.\ 40.\ 41a.\ 42.\ 43}$; (P) Lev. $23^{33\text{-}36\ 39a.\ c.\ 41b}$ Nu. $29^{12\text{-}38}$. This feast was held, according to JE, at the end of the year: according to Dt. (v.$^{13.\ 15}$) and H (Lev. $23^{39.\ 41.\ 42}$), it was to extend over seven days, which are fixed more precisely in P for the 15th to the 21st of the seventh month (Lev. $23^{33\text{-}36}$), a supernumerary day (not noticed in Dt.), marked by an *'aṣéreth* (above, on v.^{8}), being observed on the 22nd (*ib.* v.$^{36.\ 39b}$ Nu. $29^{35\text{-}38}$). In JE, this festival is called the "Feast of Ingathering" (חַג הָאָסִיף); "Feast of Booths" (v.$^{13.\ 16}$ 31^{10}) is the name used also in P (Lev. 23^{34}), and generally in the later books of the OT. (Zech. $14^{16.\ 18.\ 19}$ Ezr. 3^{4} 2 Ch. 8^{13}†): being, as it seems, the most popular, and widely observed, of the three festivals, it is also sometimes called "the Feast" (or "Pilgrimage"), κατ' ἐξοχήν, 1 K. $8^{2.\ 65}$ (= 2 Ch. 5^{3} 7^{8}) Ez. 45^{25} Neh. 8^{14}, cf. Lev. 23^{39} (H) 1 K. 12^{32}.

The name "Feast of Booths" is adopted in Dt., as already known, without explanation: it is explained in the law of H, Lev. $23^{40\text{-}43}$, where the Israelites are commanded to take "the fruit of goodly trees, fronds of palm-trees, and boughs of thick trees, and poplars of the wādy [above on 2^{13}]," and to dwell in booths (סֻכּוֹת) for seven days (cf. Neh. $8^{14\text{-}18}$), to remind them how their ancestors had dwelt in tents during their passage through the wilderness. No doubt the real origin of this feature of the festival is to be found in the custom of the villagers during the vintage taking up their abode in the vineyards in temporary booths and huts: comp. Robinson, ii. 81, who, speaking of Hebron, says, "The vintage is a season of hilarity [cf. Is. 16^{10} Jer. 25^{30b}] and rejoicing to all; the town is then deserted, and the people live among the vineyards in the lodges and in tents"; and see further on Lev. $23^{40.\ 42}$.

13 The Pilgrimage of Booths thou shalt hold thee (v.^{10}) *seven days, when thou gatherest in* (באספך) from thy threshing-floor and from thy wine-press.

15 *Seven days* thou shalt *keep pilgrimage* unto *Jehovah* your God.

Ex. 23^{16} And the Pilgrimage of *Ingathering* (חג האסיף) at the going out of the year, *when thou gatherest in* (באספך) thy labours from the field.

Ex. 34^{22} And the Pilgrimage of *Ingathering*, at the coming round (change) of the year.

Lev. 23^{39} (H) *When ye gather in* (באספכם) the produce of the earth, ye shall *keep Jehovah's Pilgrimage seven days.*

The vintage in Palestine falls about September, some four months after wheat-harvest.—**14.** *And thou shalt rejoice, &c.*] cf. v.[11]; also Lev. 23^{40b} (H).—*Because* (or *when*) *Jehovah thy God shall bless thee*] 14^{24b}.—*The work of thy hands*] on 2^{7}.—*And thou shalt be altogether joyful*] the festival is to be an occasion of unalloyed joy for the blessing of Jehovah resting upon the produce of the soil.

16–17. Concluding summary. Every male is to appear annually, at each of the three Pilgrimages, at the Central Sanctuary, with an offering such as his means enable him to bring.—This rule of old Israel is repeated from JE, with additions accommodating it to the spirit and plan of Dt.

16 *Three times in the year shall all thy males appear in the presence of Jehovah* thy God in the place which he shall choose . . . ;	Ex. 23^{17} *Three times in the year shall all thy males appear in the presence of* the Lord *Jehovah* (repeated 34^{23}, with the addition of "the God of Israel," at the end).
and none shall appear in Jehovah's *presence empty.*	Ex. $23^{15b}=34^{20b}$ *And none shall appear in* my *presence empty* (specially of *Maṣṣoth*).

Appear in the presence of] the standing phrase for visiting the sanctuary as a worshipper, esp. at the great pilgrimages (Ex. $34^{23.24}$ Dt. 31^{11} 1 S. 1^{22}), but also besides (Is. 1^{12}). It is however held by many (see below) that the existing punctuation does not represent the original vocalization, and that the true sense of the phrase is "see the face of" Jehovah, *i.e.* visit Him as a Sovereign. The phrase *see the face of* is used elsewhere of courtiers or others enjoying access to the royal presence (2 S. 3^{13} $14^{28.32}$ 2 K. 25^{19} Est. 1^{14}). Cf. Ps. 11^{7} 17^{15}

15. אך שמח] *only* rejoicing, i.e. *nought but* rejoicing, *altogether* rejoicing: so 28^{29} Is. 16^{7} 19^{11} Jer. 32^{30} Job 19^{13}.—**16.** (*bis*) את פני] *in presence of*, as 1 K. 12^{6} Ps. 16^{10} 21^{7} *al.* So with יֵרָאֶה Ex. 34^{23}, לֵרָאוֹת Ex. 34^{24} Dt. 31^{11}, נִרְאָה 1 S. 1^{22}: cf. לֵרָאוֹת פָּנַי Is. 1^{12}, יֵרָאוּ פָנַי Ex. 23^{15} 34^{20}, אֵרָאֶה פניך Ps. 42^{3}; יֵרָאֶה אל פני יי Ex. 23^{17}; יֵרָאֶה אל אלהים Ps. 84^{8}. But the constr. without את is difficult: לֵרָאוֹת is more naturally vocalized לִרְאוֹת; and hence many scholars (*e.g.* Ges.; Di. on Ex. 23^{15}; Nowack on Ps. 42^{3}; Cheyne, crit. n. on Is. 1^{12}) think that the original vocalization in all these cases was *Qal*, for which in process of time the Nif. came to be substituted (with נראה in 1 S. 1^{22} for ראה, and אל for את in Ex. 23^{17}) on account of the objection felt to the expression "seeing God." The possibility of this view being correct must be recognized (cf. Del.[4] on Is. 1^{12}): more can hardly be said; נראה (alone)=*to appear*

Digitized by Google

(חזה); $63^{8\,(2)\,a}$.—*Thy God*] 1^{21}.—**17.** *Every man shall give according to the gift of his hand, &c.*] the words explain the last clause of $v.^{16}$: every man is to bring with him an offering such as his "hand" ($v.^{10}$ 12^{6}) can afford to give (cf. Ez. $46^{5.\,11}$).

XVI. 18–XVIII. 22. *The Office-Bearers of the Theocracy.*

The above is a convenient title for the section here beginning, the subjects dealt with being *Judges* (16^{18-20} 17^{8-13}), *King* (17^{14-20}), *Priests* (18^{1-8}), and *Prophets* (18^{9-22}); but 16^{21}–17^{7} (on the purity of religious worship) forms an intrusive element, which originally perhaps stood elsewhere.

XVI. 18–20. Judges are to be appointed in the various towns of Israel, who are to administer justice with purity and singleness of motive.—The other Codes in the Pent. presuppose the existence of judges, and inculcate the duty of administering justice impartially (Ex. $23^{1-3.\,6-8}$ Lev. $19^{15.\,35a}$): but they contain no provisions respecting the authority in which these functions are to reside.

In a patriarchal society, the natural guardians of justice are the men of judgment and experience in a tribe, the heads of families, or "elders" (see on 19^{12}); thus in a modern Arab community the head man of the place, the village Ḳāḍi (قاضى = קָצִין), assisted by two or three of the principal inhabitants, judges local cases, appeal to a higher tribunal being granted when necessary (Palgrave, *Arabia*, i. 228 f.). From Ex. 21^{6} $22^{7f.\,(8f.)}$ (cf. 1 S. 2^{25}) it may be inferred that in ancient Israel judgment, especially in difficult or crucial cases, was regarded as a divine decision, and delivered at a sanctuary: comp. Ex. $18^{15f.\,19-22}$, where seeking a decision at law is called "inquiring of God," and civil decisions are styled the "statutes and laws of God." (Cf. the Homeric conception of θέμιστες, as judgments divinely dictated to a judge (*Il.* i. 238 f.), Maine, *Ancient Law*, chap. i.). The body of judges whose appointment to assist Moses is narrated in Ex. 18 do not, however, appear to have been a permanent institution: we hear later of Samuel and his sons possessing local authority as judges (1 S. 7^{15-17} $8^{1f.}$ 12^{2-4}): after the establishment of the monarchy, the king naturally became the supreme judicial authority, though probably only special cases were adjudicated by him in person (cf. 2 S. 8^{15} 14^{4-16} $15^{2.\,3f.\,6}$ 1 K. $3^{9.\,16ff.}$ 7^{7} Jer. $22^{15f.}$; Is. 16^{5} Jer. 23^{5b}); "princes," and members of the royal house, are also alluded to as exercising judicial functions, Is. 1^{23}

---

at a sanctuary occurs Is. 16^{12}.—זְכוּרְךָ] so Ex. 23^{17}=34^{23} Dt. 20^{13} (זְכוּרָהּ)†. The usual form is זָכָר (but never with a suffix). Whether the abs. form was זְכוּר (Bö. § 664^{d}) or זָכוּר (Ew. § 255^{c}), or whether indeed it was in use at all, must remain undetermined.

Digitized by Google

3^{14} Mic. 3$^{1.9}$ Jer. 21$^{11f.}$ 22$^{2f.}$ Ez. 45^{9} *al.* (cf. 2 S. 15^{3}); and "judges" in Hos. 7^{7} 13^{10} Is. 1^{26} 3^{2} Mic. 7^{3} Zeph. 3^{3}. According to 2 Ch. 19$^{5-11}$ Jehoshaphat established a more highly organized judicial system, appointing, viz. judges in the cities of Judah, and constituting in Jerusalem a tribunal consisting of Levites, priests, and heads of families, possessing supreme authority in both ecclesiastical and civil cases. In its broader features, the judicature thus established by Jehoshaphat agrees remarkably with the system prescribed—or rather presupposed—in Dt. 17$^{8-13}$ (*q.v.*). The details, however, of the judicial institutions of the Hebrews are not known to us: it is thus uncertain, for instance, whether the "judges," whose appointment is prescribed here, were independent deputies appointed by the king, or whether they were presidents, or assessors, of the local councils of "elders," qualified by their superior technical knowledge to direct, or assist, the latter. The two are mentioned as acting together in 21^{2}.

18. *Judges and officers shalt thou appoint thee in all thy gates* (12^{12}), *which Jehovah thy God is giving thee* (16^{5}), *according to thy tribes* (1$^{13.15}$)] no attempt is made to regulate the details of the institution, such as the method by which the judges are to be selected, their numbers, the organization of the courts, &c.; the Writer contents himself with affirming the broad principle that provision is to be made for the administration of justice, and that this is to be done by the appointment of judges possessing local jurisdiction. The course to be adopted in the treatment of a difficult case is, however, prescribed in 17$^{8-13}$. Elsewhere in Dt. "judges" are alluded to 17$^{9.12}$ (at the central court), 19$^{17f.}$ 21^{2} 25^{2} (and in the Mosaic age 1^{16} 29$^{9(10)}$ 𝕲; cf. in D^{2} Jos. 8^{33} 23^{2} 24^{1}): but usually (see on 19^{12}) the "elders" of a city appear as the local guardians of justice.—*Officers* (שֹׁטְרִים)] *i.e.* in all probability, subordinate officials, whose duties would be analogous to those of the modern clerk, warder, police-sergeant, &c.; see on 1^{15}.—*And they shall judge the people with righteous judgment*] this is their primary and paramount duty (cf. 1^{16}); the obligations which it involves are stated more fully in the two following verses, v.^{19} being repeated largely from the "Book of the Covenant" (and agreeing also in thought with Lev. 19$^{15.35a}$ H), v.^{20} being the Writer's own parenetic addition.—**19.** *Thou shalt not wrest judgment*] Ex. 23^{6} "Thou shalt not wrest

18. משפט צדק] cogn. acc., as Ez. 23^{45} Zc. 7^{9} 8^{16}.—**19.** וִיסַלֵּף] Ex. 23^{8} Pr. 13^{6} 19^{3} 21^{12} 22^{12} (with דברי) Job 12^{19}†; סֶלֶף Pr. 11^{3} 15^{4}†. The precise mean-

Digitized by Google

the judgment of the poor in his suit": cf. Dt. 24^{17} 27^{19}; 1 S. 8^3 Am. 5^{12} Is. 10^2.—*Thou shalt not respect persons*] the principle, as Ex. 23^3 (JE) Lev. 19^{15} (H), cf. Ps. 82^2 Pr. 18^5 Mal. 2^9 2 Ch. 19^7: the expression (הִכִּיר פָּנִים), as 1^{17} (*q.v.*).—*And thou shalt take no bribe; for a bribe blindeth the eyes of the wise, and subverteth the cause of the righteous*] repeated verbally from Ex. 23^8, except that for the "open-eyed" (פִּקְחִים) is substituted the "eyes of the wise." An epigrammatic description of the fatal effects of a bribe. For allusions to this most common source of corrupt justice in the East, see 10^{17} 27^{25} Is. 1^{23} 5^{23} Mic. 3^{11} Ez. 22^{12} Pr. 17^{23}; Ps. 15^5 Is. 33^{15}.—*Cause*] lit. *words*, *i.e.* statements, arguments, pleas, which in the aggregate are tantamount to a man's "case" or "cause"; cf. Ex. 24^{14} 2 S. 15^3 Jos. 20^4.—**20.** *Justice, justice, shalt thou follow*] the repetition expresses emphasis (cf. 2^{27}): "*justice*, and only justice—justice without intermittence—is to be thy constant aim in judgment."—*That thou mayest live, &c.*] the same promise as 4^1, cf. $5^{30\,(33)}$ 8^1.

XVI. 21–XVII. 7. *Four Enactments designed to preserve the Religion of Jehovah from Corruption or Dishonour.*

XVI. 21–22. No Ashérah, or pillar (obelisk), to be erected beside Jehovah's altar.—These two prohibitions are entirely unrelated to the subject of v.[18-20], the connexion which Schultz and Keil seek to establish, that they are meant as illustrations of the offences to be taken cognizance of by the "judges," being too forced to be probable, as well as destitute of support in the terms of the text. As the subject of 17^{8-13} is closely connected with 16^{18-20}, it is more reasonable to suppose that (unless the Writer attached little importance to order) the intermediate verses 16^{21}–17^7 have from some cause been displaced from their original position,—perhaps (Dillm.) before $13^{2\,(1)}$.—The destruction of the Ashérahs and "pillars" of the Canaanites has been enjoined in 7^5 12^3: here the introduction of similar symbols into the worship of Jehovah is prohibited. In the other Codes, the only parallel is the more generally worded

ing is uncertain; prob. *to twist, pervert*, fig. *to subvert, ruin*.—**20.** צֶדֶק צֶדֶק] G-K. § 123 d^3.

enactment Lev. 26[1] (H) ופסל ומצבה לא תקימו לכם. Both the Ashêrah and the "pillar" (מַצֵּבָה) are frequently mentioned in the OT.; and the nature of each is tolerably clear from the terms applied to them. Here, the Ashêrah is expressly described as a kind of "tree," "planted" (נטע) in the ground; Jud. 6[26] it is said to be of "wood"; elsewhere one is said to be "set up" (הציב) 2 K. 17[10], "made" (עשה) 1 K. 14[15] *al.*; when one is destroyed, the verbs used are to "cut down" (כרת) Ex. 34[13], "hew down" (גִּדַּע) c. 7[5], "pluck up" (נתש) Mic. 5[13], "pull down" (נתץ) 2 Ch. 34[7], "break in pieces" (שִׁבַּר) *ib.* v.[4], "burn with fire" c. 12[3]. Some of these references would be compatible with the rendering of 𝔊 ἄλσος (whence AV. "grove"); but others are plainly inconsistent with it. From a survey of all the passages in which the word is used, it appears that the Ashêrah was a post or pole, planted in the ground, like an English Maypole, beside an altar, whether of Baʿal (Jud. 6[25-30]) or of Jehovah, especially on the "high-places" (1 K. 14[23] 2 K. 17[10]: cf. Jer. 17[2]), and venerated as a sacred symbol. By the ancient Semites trees were often revered, as the abode of a deity (on 11[30]), and altars were built beside them; and (so far as can be judged) the Ashêrah appears to have been the representative of the sacred tree, used where an actual tree was not available, first by the Canaanites, and then, in imitation of them, by the unspiritual Israelites (cf. W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.* p. 171 f.). A famous Ashêrah, which "stood" in Samaria, under Jehoaḥaz, is alluded to 2 K. 13[6],—probably the one "made" by Aḥab, 1 K. 16[33]. Manasseh erected one in the Temple of Jerusalem (2 K. 21[7]), which was destroyed by Josiah (*ib.* 23[6. 7]).

The *'Ashêrah* (אשרה) must be carefully distinguished from *'Ashtōreth* (עשתרת), the Phœnician consort of Ba'al: in the Heb. the two names are quite different; and it is not even known that the Ashêrah was a symbol of 'Ashtōreth. Whether the Ashêrah was solely a sacred symbol, or whether there was also a deity bearing the same name, is disputed. In most of the passages where the term occurs, it certainly denotes simply the former, but there are a few (Jud. 3[7] 1 K. 15[13] 18[19] 2 K. 21[7] 23[4]) which appear to support the latter view, though not, perhaps, quite conclusively. The Tell-el-Amarna inscriptions contain a name *Abad-Ashratu* (*RP.*[2] v. 97, vi. 50; Schrader, *Z. f. Ass.* iii. 363 f.), which is considered to show that there

21. אשרה כל עץ] an Ashêrah, (even) any tree (cf. on 18[1]).

Digitized by Google

was a Semitic goddess Ashêrah; but the bearing of this fact upon the Ashêrah of the OT. cannot as yet be said to be perfectly clear (cf. *DB.*^{2} *s.v.*; Smith, *l.c.* p. 173 *n.*). The name Ashêrah has (hitherto) been found only twice in Phœnician; in an inscription from Kition (*ZDMG.* 1881, p. 424) a person dedicates a statue (if read correctly) "to his lady, the mother of the Ashêrah" (read differently in the *CIS.* I. i. 13); and one from Ma'zub, near Ptolemais, speaks of the portico of a temple built לעשתרת באשרת "for 'Ashtōreth in the Ashêrah" (Clermont-Ganneau, *Rec. d Archéol. Orient.* i. 81), which is explained by Max Ohnefalsch-Richter, *Cyprus, the Bible, and Homer*, pp. 165, 168, as referring to an image of 'Ashtōreth standing in a small niche *in* an Ashêrah (comp. Plate xvii. 2, an image of Artemis similarly placed). In the same elaborate, but not very critical, work, the author gives numerous representations from gems, &c., partly of Assyrian or Babylonian, partly of Phœnician origin, of what he considers to correspond to both the Ashêrah, and (see the next note) the *Maṣṣēbah* of the OT. (pp. 142–179, with the Plates there referred to): the former sometimes having the appearance of a tree, but generally being little more than a pole, and both standing often beside an altar, with an officiating priest, and sometimes with a divine being seated in front. (One of these representations, from Khorsabad, in which a priest appears to be anointing the sacred emblem, may be seen also in Rawlinson, *Anc. Mon.*^{4} ii. 37.) This explanation seems to be not improbable; but it must be remembered it is not more than a conjecture: the emblems in question being nowhere actually *styled* either Ashêrahs or *Maṣṣēbahs*. For a representation of a Phœnician *Maṣṣēbah*, as well as (apparently) of a sacred pole, see Benzinger, *Hebr. Arch.* p. 380 f., or Nowack, *Hebr. Arch.* ii. 18 f.

Whatever the precise nature of the symbolism of the Ashêrah may have been, the heathen associations attaching to it were amply sufficient to explain its prohibition in connexion with the worship of Jehovah (cf. Is. 17^{8} 27^{9} Mic. 5^{13}). The prohibition, as it here stands, may be borrowed from an earlier statute-book: as Dillmann observes, it presupposes by its wording ("beside the altar of Jehovah thy God, which thou shalt make thee") the law of Ex. 20^{24}: had it been first formulated by D, it would probably have contained some express reference to "the place which Jehovah should choose."

The *pillar* (מַצֵּבָה, lit. something *set up*, cf. with הִצִּיב Gn. 35^{14}) is mentioned as a heathen symbol of the Canaanites (Ex. 23^{24} Dt. 7^{5} 12^{3}); it is alluded to as erected in, or near, a temple of Ba'al (2 K. 3^{2} 10$^{26.27}$), and in proximity to Ashêrim (1 K. 14^{23} 2 K. 17^{10} 18^{4} 23^{14}). Originally, it is probable, the *maṣṣēbah* corresponded to what now would be called a *menhir*; consisting, viz. of a natural boulder or block of stone (Gen. 28$^{11.18.22}$ 31$^{45.51f.}$), broader at one end than the

Digitized by Google

other, erected perpendicularly, which was regarded by the heathen Semites as the abode of a deity (cf. Smith, *Rel. Sem.* 183–188: the Phœnicians are said to have venerated ἔμψυχοι λίθοι), and honoured by them with libations of milk, honey, oil, &c. In process of time, however, an artificial obelisk took the place of the natural boulder: the term occurs in this sense in Phœnician and Palmyrene (see below); and the lofty stone obelisks in front of the temple of Tum (the sun) at Heliopolis—one of which is the so-called "Cleopatra's Needle"—are referred to by Jeremiah (43^{13}) under the same name. An "obelisk" was the distinguishing mark of a holy place, and often stood beside an altar (cf. Hos. 3^4 $10^{1.2}$). At one time, it seems, the *maṣṣēbah* was employed freely as a religious symbol in the worship of Jehovah (cf. Gn. $28^{18.22}$ $31^{45.51f.}$ Ex. 24^4 Is. 19^{19}); but ultimately, like the Ashérah, it came to be proscribed on account of its heathen associations (cf. Mic. 5^{12}).—*Which Jehovah thy God hateth*] 12^{31}.

XVII. 1. All animals offered in sacrifice to Jehovah to be without blemish.—From the context (which, on both sides, is directed against the practices of idolatry), and the use of the term "abomination" (comp. on 7^{25}), it may perhaps be inferred (Dillm.) that in the idolatrous sacrifices with which the author was familiar, no importance was attached to this point. There is no corresponding law in JE. In H, the parallel is Lev. 22^{17-25}, where the physical conditions that must be satisfied in order that a sacrifice may be accepted (לְרָצֹן) are particularized, and an enumeration of disqualifying faults is given.

22. מצבה] מצבה occurs oft. in Phœn. (*CIS.* I. i. 44^1 46^1 57^1 58^1 [all from Kition in Cyprus], 116^1 [Athens] *al.*), mostly of a commemorative obelisk (מצבה בחים, *i.e.* "cippus inter vivos," Nos. 58, 59), erected over a tomb (cf. Gn. 35^{20} 2 S. 18^{18}), but once (No. 44), probably, of an obelisk erected to a deity. No. 44 shows what a מצבה was: for it is inscribed on the pedestal of an actual obelisk, made of marble, about 5 feet in height (see the photograph in the volume of plates in the *CIS.*). In an Inscription from Palmyra, now in the British Museum (*Vienna Orient. Journ.* 1894, p. 11 ff.), a מצבא, about 1½ ft. high by 1 ft. broad, with a bearded warrior, holding a spear and shield, figured upon it, is described as erected by the donor לשדרפא אלהא טבא די יהא גיר בה הו ובני ביתה כלהן "to the good god Shadrapa (Pausan. vi. 25. 6 Σατράπης: see *Journ. As.* 1877, x. 157 ff.), that he might be a guest (Cheyne on Ps. 15^1) with him, he and all the members of his family."

In P there is no explicit regulation on the subject; but it is a standing principle (Lev. $1^{3.10}$ &c.) that the animal offered in sacrifice is to be "perfect" (תָּמִים), *i.e.* unblemished. From a *mere* comparison of the two parallel laws, it is impossible to determine whether the law of Dt., or that of H, is the earlier: the former, regarded in itself, might, for instance, be a summary of the more detailed provisions of Lev. 22^{17-25}, or the latter might be an expansion in detail of the principle stated generally in Dt.; the question of the relative priority of the two laws can thus be argued only upon independent considerations. The phrasing of the law here is Deuteronomic ("Jehovah *thy God*" (1^{21}); the generalizing asyndeton "any evil thing," see on 18^{1}; "abomination," 7^{25}).—*Wherein is a blemish* (מום)] cf. Lev. 22^{20} (כל אשר בו מום לא תקריבו כי לא לרצון יהיה לכם). The same restriction has already been laid down in the case of firstlings, 15^{21}, where lameness and blindness are instanced as examples of disqualifying "blemish": here it is extended to sacrifices in general.—(Even) *any evil thing*] generalizing the idea of "blemish": cf. 15^{21} כל מום רע.

2–7. An Israelite, convicted of idolatry, to be stoned to death.—In JE there is the more categorical, but less explicit, enactment (Ex. $22^{19 (20)}$) זֹבֵחַ לָאֱלֹהִים יָחֳרָם בִּלְתִּי לַיהוָה לְבַדּוֹ. The punishment of death has already been decreed ($13^{7ff.}$) for the bare attempt to seduce into idolatry; hence it is not more than consistent for it to be imposed in the case when idolatry has been actually practised. Both in subject-matter and phraseology, the present section is closely allied to c. 13; and perhaps (as suggested on 16^{21}) once immediately preceded it. In any case, its position here cannot be naturally explained as affording an example of a capital offence likely to come for trial before the "judges" of 16^{18-20}.—**2.** *If there be found in thy midst*] cf. $13^{2 (1)}$ 21^{1}; 18^{10} 22^{22} 24^{7}.—*In one of thy gates, &c.*] as 16^{5}: see on 12^{12}.—*That which is evil in the eyes of Jehovah*] on 4^{25}.—*In transgressing* (לעבר) *his covenant*] Jos. $7^{11.15}$; and (followed as

XVII. 1. דבר רע] "evil thing," of a physical disfigurement, as c. 23^{10} of something conventionally unbecoming; 2 K. 4^{41} Ps. 41^{9}, of what is physically harmful: Ps. 64^{6} 141^{4} of what is morally harmful.—**2–4.** ... אשר יעשה ... וַיֵּלֶךְ ... וְהֻגַּד] "who *doeth* ... and *hath gone* ..., and *it be told*" (Dr. § 115, *s.v.* אשר *Obs.*).

Digitized by Google

here by *go and serve other gods*) Jos. 23^{16} (D²).—**3.** *Gone and served other gods, &c.*] the same phrase as $13^{7.\,14\,(6.\,13)}$ $29^{25\,(26)}$ Jos. 23^{16} (D^2): so 1 S. 26^{19} 1 K. 9^{6} (Deut.).—*The sun, or the moon, or the host of heaven*] 4^{19}.—*Which I have not commanded*] the first person, of God, as 7^{4}. For the litotes, "have not commanded," cf. Jer. 7^{31} 19^{5} 32^{35}, also 7^{22}.—**4.** *And it be told thee, and thou hear it, and inquire, &c.*] the expressions as $13^{15\,(14)}$, in a similar connexion.—**5.** *Then thou shalt bring forth . . . unto thy gates . . . and thou shalt stone them, &c.*] similarly 22^{24}. The offender, when convicted, is to be *brought out* (viz. for execution: Gn. 38^{25}) to the gates of his city, in order that the execution may take place outside its precincts (comp. in P Lev. 24^{14} Nu. 15^{36}; also Acts 7^{58} Heb. 13^{12}). For the penalty of stoning, comp. in H Lev. 20^{2} (for Molech-worship). —**6.** No accused person is, however, to be put to death on the testimony of a single witness. The provision secures the application to a particular case of the same safeguard against the disastrous effects of dishonest or mistaken testimony, which is enunciated more generally in 19^{15}; in Nu. 35^{30} (P) the same protection is accorded to the person charged with murder.—**7.** It is to be the duty of the witnesses to take the lead in carrying the sentence into effect: cf. $13^{10\,(9)}$.—*So thou shalt exterminate the evil from thy midst*] as $13^{6\,(5)}$, where see note.

XVII. 8–XVIII. 22. *The Office-Bearers of the Theocracy (resumed from 16^{18-20}).*

8–13. On the jurisdiction of the supreme central tribunal. —When a case arises, whether in criminal or civil law, too difficult to be adjudicated by the local courts (16^{18}), it is to be referred to the tribunal of the central sanctuary, whose decision is to be final, and whose verdict, under penalty of death, is to be obeyed implicitly by all. The paragraph, it is evident, connects immediately with 16^{18-20}. From v.⁹, compared with 19^{17}, it appears that the supreme tribunal here contemplated is conceived by the Writer as composed partly of Levitical

4. היטב] 9^{21}.—והנה אמת וג'] 13^{15}.—**6.** יומת המת] with the cognate ptcp. (on 15^{2}) expressed: so 22^{8} 2 S. 17^{9} Is. 28^{4} Ez. 18^{32} 33^{4}.

Digitized by Google

priests (18^{1}), partly of lay "judges"; it was thus similar in constitution to the court appointed, according to 2 Ch. $19^{8.11}$, by Jehoshaphat at Jerusalem (p. 200). It is to be observed, however, that this supreme tribunal is not here *instituted* for the first time: it is represented as already existing, and its constitution is supposed to be known: the law of Dt. is limited to defining its powers, and specifying the class of cases of which it is to take cognizance. The general principle of referring serious or complicated cases to a higher authority is in harmony with the provision made in the case of the judicature instituted by Moses, Ex. $18^{22.26}$ (Dt. 1^{17b}). 19^{16-18} supplies an example of a case so referred to the central tribunal, viz. a charge of false witness.

For *priests* taking part in the administration of justice, comp. 21^{5} Is. 28^{7} Ez. 44^{24}. As remarked on 16^{18}, judgment in ancient Israel, even on secular issues, seems often to have been administered at a sanctuary: the priests would thus possess an hereditary knowledge of civil and criminal law not less than of ceremonial law, which, especially at a time when Hebrew law was still imperfectly codified, would naturally give them an advantage over either the local "elders," or the ordinary lay judges. Hence they would be properly represented on a tribunal, appointed expressly for the purpose of dealing with difficult or serious cases.

8. *If a matter be too difficult for thee* (יִפָּלֵא מִמְּךָ) *in judgment*] lit. *too exceptional* (or *wonderful*) *for thee*, *i.e.* beyond thy power to unravel or decide; comp. 30^{11} (beyond one's power to master); Gn. 18^{14} Jer. 32^{17} (beyond one's power to effect); Job 42^{3} (beyond one's power to comprehend). Not the word used in Ex. $18^{22.26}$ Dt. 1^{17} (קשה, "hard").—*Between blood and blood, and between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke,* (even) *the subjects of pleadings*] *i.e.* if the difficulty be to determine under what law a particular case is to be judged, whether, for example ("between blood and blood"), a man be guilty of murder or only of manslaughter (Ex. 21^{12-14}), or whether a man charged with theft or embezzlement, or with having caused some personal injury (Ex. $21^{18ff.}$; $22^{1ff.}$), has been culpably negligent or not, and, if so, in what degree, and to what penalty he is liable,—whatever the nature of the pleadings (on both sides) may be (cf. 2 Ch. 19^{10}).—*Within thy*

8. דברי ריבת] in loose appos. with דבר, a constr. which D often has: 2^{26} 3^{5} 4^{28} 6^{10b} 8^{15} 9^{1b} 11^{14} 20^{1} 22^{6} 27^{15} $28^{36.64}$ $29^{16.22}$; cf. on 18^{1}.

Digitized by Google

gates] 12^{12}.—*Thou shalt arise, &c.*] the persons implicitly addressed (as appears from the words "too difficult for thee in judgment") are the local judges, who, in such a contingency, are to refer the case to the tribunal at the central sanctuary.—*Go up*] the expression used of visiting Shiloh (1 S. $1^{3.7.21.22}$), or Jerusalem (1 K. $12^{27.28}$, and often).—**9.** *Unto the priests the Levites*] *i.e.* to the Levitical priests (on 18^{1}).—*And unto the judge that shall be in those days*] for the expression, comp. 19^{17} 26^{3} Jos. 20^{6} (D^2). It seems evident that the "judge" is not identical with any of the "priests"; and as in 19^{17} "the priests and the judges" are mentioned together in a similar connexion, it appears reasonable to infer that priests and laymen sat together on the tribunal referred to: the "judge" mentioned here being the foreman, or president, of the body of lay "judges" mentioned in 19^{17}, just as the "priest" in 17^{12} must be the president of the "priests" mentioned in v.^{9}. The court instituted by Jehoshaphat had similarly a double presidency, the high priest acting as head in ecclesiastical cases, and a secular prince in civil cases (2 Ch. $19^{8.11}$).—*And thou shalt inquire, &c.*] *i.e.* examine the case (19^{18}),—Israel, acting in the persons of its representatives for the time being, *i.e.* here the members of the central tribunal, being addressed. Sam. 𝔊, however, have "and *they* shall inquire (ודרשו)," which (as in the context the 2nd person denotes the local judges) is easier, and may be correct.—*And they shall declare to thee the word of judgment*] *i.e.* the sentence (2 Ch. 19^{6}). For *shew* (AV., RV.), here and v.$^{10.11}$, in the sense of *declare*, see on 5^{5}.—**10–13.** The decision of the central tribunal is to be implicitly obeyed.—**10.** *Observe to do*] 5^{1}.—*According to all that they direct thee* (יורוך)] so v.^{11} "according to the *direction* wherewith they *direct* thee." הוֹרָה is *to direct* (Ex. $4^{12.15}$), *tôrāh* ("law") is properly *direction*,—both words being used especially, in a technical sense, of the authoritative *direction* given by the priests to the laity on matters of ceremonial observance (see *e.g.* 24^{8} 33^{10} Lev. 10^{11} Ez. 22^{26} 44^{23} Mic. 3^{11}; Jer. 2^{8} 18^{18} Lev. 11^{46} 13^{59} 14^{54} 15^{32} Nu. 5^{29} 6^{21} &c.). In a somewhat wider sense, *tôrāh* is then applied, in Dt. (on 1^{5}), and Deut. writers (as Jos. 1^{7} 23^{6} 1 K. 2^{3} 2 K. 10^{31} 14^{6} [Dt. 24^{16}] 17^{13} 21^{8} $22^{8.11}$

Digitized by Google

$23^{24.\,25}$ Jer. 16^{11}), to the exposition of an Israelite's duty contained in Dt.: finally, still more generalized, it becomes the name of the Pentateuch generally (cf. Neh. $8^{1f.\,18f.}$ $10^{35.\,37\,(34.\,36)}$ 2 Ch. 31^{3}). See further *OTJC.*² pp. 299 ff., 372 ff., 382 f., 425 f.; Kuenen, *Hex.* § 10. 4. Here it refers (unusually) to decisions on points of secular law (comp. Ex. $18^{16.\,20}$), being used, probably, on account of the fact that the verdict of the supreme tribunal came with the authority of priests as well as of lay judges.—*Turn aside, &c.*] on 2^{27}.—**12.** *The priest*] the ecclesiastical president of the tribunal; comp. on v.^{9}.—*That standeth to minister there to Jehovah*] see on 10^{8}.—*Or unto the judge*] v.^{9}. By *or* it seems to be implied that the verdict was delivered sometimes by the ecclesiastical president of the board, sometimes by its civil president; the procedure may have varied according to the nature of the case under consideration.—*And thou shalt exterminate the evil from Israel*] the same formula as $13^{6\,(5)}$ 17^{7}.—**13.** *And all the people shall hear and fear, &c.*] comp. $13^{12\,(11)}$, where see note.

14–20. The character and duties of the King.—The king, if one be elected by Israel, is to be a man who has Jehovah's approval; he is to be a native Israelite; he is not, in his court-establishment, to imitate the great despots of the East; and he is to rule in accordance with the principles of Israel's religion.—The king, in spite of his obviously superior dignity, follows the judges ($16^{18\text{-}20}$),—no doubt, on account of the monarchy being an institution not essential to the theocracy (which as a matter of history subsisted long without it): accordingly, as the terms of v.^{14} show, his appointment is not enjoined by the legislator, but only permitted. The monarchy became ultimately a necessity in Israel, for the better administration and consolidation of the nation (1 S. $8^{5.\,6.\,20}$ [contrast Jud. 17^{6} 21^{25}] 9^{16}): it was David's great merit to have placed it upon a religious basis, and to have shown how its power could be wielded so as to promote the truest interests of the people; hence he became to later ages the ideal of a pious and noble-minded theocratic king (Hos. 3^{5} Is. 55^{4} 1 K. 11^{1} 14^{8} &c.). The present law is peculiar to Dt. In estimating it, it is

12. והאיש אשר . . . ומת האיש ההוא] Dr. §§ 123 *α*; 197 *Obs.* 2.

Digitized by Google

important to notice that its provisions are entirely *theocratic*: they do not define a political constitution, or limit the autocracy of the king in civil matters. It thus stands entirely out of relation with the מִשְׁפַּט הַמֶּלֶךְ, or מִשְׁפַּט הַמְּלֻכָה, of 1 S. $8^{9.11}$ 10^{25}. The aim of the law is to show how the monarchy, if established, is to conform to the same theocratic principles which govern other departments of the community; and how the dangers with which it may threaten Israel's national character and Israel's faith, may be most effectually averted. At the same time, though the nucleus of the law may be ancient (v.^{15}), in its present form it is doubtless designed as an attempt to check the moral and religious degeneracy which the monarchy, as a fact, too often displayed.—**14.** *When thou art come into the land, &c.*] 26^{1}; cf. 18^{9} (also 6^{10}).—*And shalt say* (12^{20}), *I will set over me a king like all the nations that are round about me*] comp. 1 S. 8^{5} "now set us a king to judge us, like all the nations" (cf. v.^{20} 10^{19}): see further p. 213.—*Round about me*] 6^{14} $13^{8(7)}$.—**15.** The two conditions which the king is to satisfy: he is to be one whom Jehovah approves, and he is not to be a foreigner.—*Whom Jehovah thy God shall choose*] cf. (of Saul) 1 S. 10^{24} "whom Jehovah hath chosen"; (of David) 1 S. 16^{8-10} (implicitly), 2 S. 6^{21}: for the general thought, also, 1 S. $9^{16f.}$ 10^{1} 2 S. 7^{8} &c. Both Saul and David were appointed under the authority of the prophet Samuel: for the N. kingdom, cf. 1 K. $11^{29ff.}$ $14^{7ff.}$ $16^{1-4.7}$ 19^{16} $21^{21f.}$ 2 K. 9^{1-3}.—*Thou mayest not put a foreigner over thee*] the prohibition is a remarkable one, as it is difficult to imagine what attractions the rule of a foreigner can have possessed for Israel, and there are no traces in the history of either kingdom of a desire to establish it (the supposition that the project to make Tab'el king in place of Ahaz, Is. 7^{6}, met with support in Judah, being an uncertain inference from Is. 8^{6}). Possibly there may have been examples of foreigners rising to despotic power among Israel's neighbours (? Gn. 36^{37} Dillm.). Not improbably, however, the motive of the provision is a religious one. A foreigner would not only be deficient in national feeling, and

14. וישבת בה] on 14^{26}.—**15.** לא תוכל] as 7^{22}.—אשר לא אחיך הוא] so 20^{15} (Dr. § 198 *Obs.* 1; *Lex.* הוא **3 c**).

Digitized by Google

be liable to rule tyrannically, but he would be likely to endanger Israel's distinctive nationality, by introducing a heathen element into this most important dignity. The prohibition may well be an old one (Dillm.; Del., *ZKWL.* 1880, p. 565), repeated by D from one of his sources.—**16–17.** Even, however, when a king has been appointed, who satisfies the conditions prescribed in v.[15], his liberty is not absolute; and there follow now three limitations of it, v.[16f.]: he is not to multiply horses, or wives, or riches.—**16.** *Seeing that Jehovah hath said, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way*] the same saying is referred to again 28[68]; it is not to be found in our present Pentateuch, but the thought of Ex. 13[17] 14[13] is similar; and the proposal of the people to return to Egypt, Nu. 14[3-4] (cf. 11[20]), is plainly represented in the context as contrary to the Divine intention. It is probable that, as in other cases (cf. on 1[22] 10[1-3. 8. 9]), the actual words were still read in some part of the narrative of JE, extant at the time when Dt. was composed. The horses, which the Israelitish king is forbidden to multiply, are, of course, such as were intended for use in war.

The Israelites were deficient in cavalry, and were consequently often unable to hold their own beside the nations of Canaan (Jos. 17[16] Jud. 1[19] 4[3] 1 S. 13[5f.]); nevertheless, prior to the age of Solomon, they do not appear to have made any attempt to supply the deficiency, and are even recorded, more than once, to have houghed the horses, and burnt the chariots, captured by them in war (Jos. 11[4. 6. 9] 2 S. 8[4]). Egypt, however, at least from the 18th dynasty (Wilkinson-Birch, *Anc. Eg.*[2] ii. 101; Rawlinson, *Hist. of Eg.* 1881, i. 74, ii. 206, 215), was celebrated for its horses (cf. Ex. 14[7] 15[4]; *Il.* ix. 383f.); and Solomon procured cavalry thence on a large scale (1 K. 5[6] [4[26]] 10[26. 28f.]); horses and chariots are often mentioned subsequently as a standing component of the army in both kingdoms; in the time of Hezekiah (30[2. 16] 31[1] 36[9]), as afterwards in that of Zedekiah (Ez. 17[15]), the cavalry of Egypt was an important factor in the calculations of the politicians of Judah.

The legislator, like the prophets, esp. Isaiah, discountenances both dealings with Egypt (Is. 30[1-5. 7] 31[1-3]; Jer. 2[18. 36]), and the multiplication of horses and chariots (Is. 2[7] 31[1]: cf. Hos. 14[4 (3)] Mic. 5[10 (9)] &c.). It is difficult not to think that there is in his words a covert reference to the policy inaugurated by Solomon.—*Nor cause the people to return to Egypt*]

16. ויהוה אמר] "*when* (or *seeing that*) J. hath said": a circumstantial clause (Dr. § 159).

not to be understood literally (as Nu. 14^{4}): the meaning is that the king is not to act counter to Jehovah's intention in forbidding the people to return to Egypt, by sending his merchants (1 K. 10^{28}), or his ambassadors (Is. 30^{1-5}), thither in quest of cavalry.—**17.** *Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not aside* (Jer. 17^{5}); *neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold*] two other practices, calculated to impart a sensual and worldly tone to the character of the king, in which likewise an evil precedent was set by Solomon (1 K. 11^{3-8}; $10^{14-25. 27}$): the influence of a harem was likely in other ways also to be pernicious to the State.—**18–20.** The king, when established upon his throne, is to transcribe for himself a copy of the Deuteronomic law, which he is to study daily, in order that its principles may become the rule of his life, and that he may govern his subjects in the just and equitable spirit which it everywhere commends.—**18.** *This law*] *i.e.*, as uniformly in this book (on 1^{5}), the Deuteronomic legislation, from the standard copy of which, in the custody of the Levitical priests, at the central sanctuary ($31^{9. 26}$), the king's transcript was to be made.—**19.** *It shall be with him, &c.*] *i.e.* it is to be ever at his side, and he is to study it habitually (comp. Jos. 1^{8}).—*That he may learn to fear, &c.*] 4^{10} 14^{23b}; $5^{26 (29)}$ 6^{2}.—**20.** *That his heart be not lifted up* (8^{14}) *above his brethren*] the same principles of loyalty towards God, and of sympathetic regard for men, which Dt. ever inculcates so warmly, are to rule the life both of the king and of his subjects; he is not therefore to treat those who after all are his "brethren" (v.^{15}) with arrogance, or to forget the obligations towards them which his office involves (comp. *e.g.* Jehoiakim's abuse of his position, denounced by Jeremiah, 22^{13-19}).—*Turn not aside, &c.*] v.^{11} $5^{29 (32)}$.—*Prolong days*] $4^{26. 40}$.

It remains to consider briefly the relation of Dt. 17^{14-20} to the account in 1 Sam. of the establishment of the monarchy in Israel. This is told in *two* narratives. In one, the older narrative (9^{1}–$10^{16. 27b}$ $11^{1-11. 15}$ 13–14), the

18. וכתב לו מלפני] לפני might signify "under the eye of, in the keeping of" (cf. Mal. 3^{1} Is. 65^{6}); and כתב מלפני is said on the analogy of לקח מלפני Ex. 36^{3}, גזל מלפני Dt. 28^{31}: cf. Jer. 31^{36}.—משנה] *copy*, lit. *repetition*, *duplicate* (cf. Jos. 8^{32}). 𝔊 τὸ δευτερονόμιον τοῦτο (whence the name of the Book), which would require הזה for הזאת.—**20.** סור] on 4^{21}.—על] cf. Is. 9^{6} 2 Ch. 1^{1} Dan. $4^{=}$.

Digitized by Google

proposal to appoint a king is viewed without the smallest disapproval or censure; in the other (7^{2-17} 8. 10^{17-27a} 12) it is treated as a grave offence against Jehovah, and fraught with danger for the nation's future (8^{11-18}). The second of these narratives (which alone has points of contact with Dt.) cannot, on various grounds (cf. *L.O.T.* pp. 166–168), be regarded as containing the *ipsissima verba* of either Samuel or the people; it rather gives expression to the fears and doubts which Samuel, no doubt, in view of a great constitutional innovation, actually felt, in a form moulded by the experiences of a later age, when the evils which the monarchy had brought with it—its encroachments on the liberties of the people (8^{11-18}), its tendencies to idolatry, and its reluctance to listen to the warnings of the prophets (cf. the ominous anticipations in 12^{14-25})—had made themselves keenly felt. This narrative, now, shows no indications of the law of Dt. having been known in *fact*, either to Samuel, or to the people who demanded of him a king: had such been the case, it is incredible either that Samuel should have resisted the application of the people as he is represented as doing, or—if *per impossibile* he did this—that the people should not have appealed to the law, as a sufficient justification of their request; the supposition (which would admit of the law not being unknown to him) that Samuel condemned not the request, as such, but the temper in which it was made, being not borne out by the terms of the narrative. On the other hand, the resemblance of Dt. $17^{14b. 15a}$ with 1 S. 8^5 10^{24} (cited above) seems too great to be accidental: the law of Dt. will therefore have been known to the *author* of the narrative of Sam., and the two phrases referred to will be reminiscences from it; unless, indeed, the other alternative be adopted, and the author of Dt. 17^{14-20} be supposed to have been influenced, as he wrote, by his recollections of the narrative of Sam. (so Budde, *Richter und Samuel*, p. 183 f.; Cornill, *Einl.* § 17. 4). As the nucleus of 1 S. 8; 10^{17-27a} 12 appears to be pre-Deuteronomic (*L.O.T. l.c.*), the latter alternative is not the least probable one.

XVIII. 1–8. The revenues of the Priests.—The priestly tribe is to receive no territorial inheritance in Israel; its inheritance is to consist of the altar-dues, and of the first-fruits offered by the Israelites to Jehovah, v.$^{1-5}$. A member of the tribe coming voluntarily from the country to officiate at the central sanctuary, shall share in these dues equally with those already on the spot, v.$^{6-8}$. In JE, priests, and "sons of Levi," are alluded to (Ex. $19^{22. 24}$ $32^{26. 28}$); but no provisions are laid down respecting their duties or rights. In P they are the subject of very precise regulations, which in some respects differ widely from those of Dt.; see p. 219 f.—1. *The priests the Levites*] *i.e.* the priests of the tribe of Levi, the Levitical priests, the standing designation of the priests in Dt. ($17^{9. 18}$ 24^8 27^9: cf. "the priests the sons of Levi," 21^5 31^9), occurring

besides Jos. 3^{3} 8^{33} (both D^{2}), Jer. 33^{18} (cf. $v.^{21}$), Ez. 43^{19} 44^{15} 2 Ch. 5^{5} (preserving probably the true reading of 1 K. 8^{4}; p. 122), 23^{18} 30^{27}† (Is. 66^{21} 1 Ch. 9^{2} Ezr. 10^{5} Neh. $10^{29.\,35\,(28.\,34)}$ 11^{20} are different, the conj. *and* being omitted). In P the priesthood is limited strictly to the descendants of Aaron, and priests are accordingly always styled "the sons of *Aaron*," Lev. $1^{5.\,8.\,11}$ 2^{2} $3^{2.\,3.\,5}$ &c.—(Even) *all the tribe of Levi*] an explanatory apposition to "the priests the Levites." Such explanatory appositions are frequent in Dt. (2^{37b} $3^{4b.\,13.\,18}$ 4^{19} 5^{8} 15^{21} 16^{21} 17^{1} 20^{14} $23^{20\,(19)}$ 25^{16} $29^{9\,(10)}$ [in neg. sentences the Heb. *all* becomes in Engl. *any*; and 16^{21} there is no *of* in the Heb.]), and denote regularly the entire group, of which one or more representative items have been specified in the preceding words. The wording of the verse implies (what is consonant with the language used elsewhere) that in Dt. the priestly office is not confined to the descendants of Aaron, but may be exercised by members of the tribe without distinction (see p. 220).—*Shall have no portion or inheritance with Israel*] *i.e.* no territorial possession, like the rest of Israel; similarly 10^{9} 12^{12b} $14^{27b.\,29}$, cf. Jos. $13^{14a.\,33a}$ 18^{7} (all D^{2}); and in P, Nu. 18^{20} (of the priests), $^{23.\,24}$ (of the Levites), 26^{62} Jos. 14^{3} (of the whole tribe).—*Jehovah's fire-offerings, and his inheritance, shall they eat*] *i.e.* live upon; this is their substitute for a landed inheritance: comp. Jos. 13^{14} 1 S. 2^{28}. *Fire-offering* is a technical term of the priestly legislation, occurring 62 times in P, otherwise only here, Jos. 13^{14}, and 1 S. 2^{28}; it is thus used of the burnt-offering (Lev. 1^{9}), the meal-offering (2^{3}), the thank-offering (3^{3}), the guilt-offering (7^{5}), in all of which specified parts were the perquisite of the priests (Lev. 2^{3} 7^{6-10}; Nu. $18^{9\,f.}$). By "and his (*i.e.* Jehovah's) inheritance" must be meant other sacred dues, not included in the "fire-offerings," rendered to God, in the persons of His representatives, the priestly tribe, *e.g.* first-fruits ($v.^{3}$).—2. The principle of $v.^{1}$ repeated more emphatically.—*In the midst of his brethren*] cf. 10^{9}.—*Jehovah is his inheritance, as he spake unto him*] Jehovah is here said to be the "inheritance" (see on 10^{9}) of the entire tribe (cf. in D^{2} Jos. $13^{14.\,33}$ 18^{7}); in P (Nu. 18^{20b}; so Ez. 44^{28}) He is said to be the inheritance of "Aaron," *i.e.* of the priests

Digitized by Google

alone. The passage referred to, as shown on 10[9], does not occur in our existing Pentateuch.—**3–4.** A specification of the principal items included in the "fire-offerings" and "inheritance" of v.[1], viz. the priests' share in the peace-offerings and first-fruits, the two kinds of offering most frequently and regularly rendered by the people at large.—**3.** *And this shall be the right of the priests from the people,* (even) *from them that sacrifice the sacrifice, whether ox or sheep: he shall give to the priest the shoulder, the two cheeks, and the maw*] the first part of the v. may be illustrated from 1 S. 2[12f.] (reading with 𝔊𝔖𝔗 and many moderns, הכהן מאת העם) "the sons of 'Eli . . . knew not Jehovah, nor *the right* (*i.e.* the rightful due) *of the priest from the people*: when any man *sacrificed a sacrifice,* the priest's servant used to come," &c. By *the sacrifice* is meant the most ordinary and usual kind of sacrifice, accompanied (12[7]) by a religious feast, and called, where distinction is needed, the *peace-* or *thank-offering* (on 12[6]). The *shoulder* (lit. *arm*) is mentioned Nu. 6[19] (of the ram offered by the Nazirite); the *cheeks,* and the *maw* (not elsewhere: 𝔊 ἔνυστρον, the fourth stomach of ruminants—a favourite dish at Athens, Aristoph. *Eq.* 356, 1179), are not otherwise mentioned in connexion with sacrifice. The passage is in direct contradiction with Lev. 7[32-34] (P), which prescribes the *breast* and the *right thigh* as the priest's due of the peace-offerings.

Various attempts have been made to remove the discrepancy. (1) According to the Jews (Jos. *Ant.* iv. 4. 4; Philo, *præm. sacerd.* § 3, Mangey, ii. 235; Mishnah, *Ḥullin* 10. 1; so Curtiss, *Lev. Priests*, p. 43 f.) the reference in Dt. is not to sacrifices at all, but to animals slaughtered at home for domestic use (12[15f.]). This, however, is an incredible explanation of זבחי הזבח: זֶבַח occurs some 160 times in the OT., and *always* (including the fig. passages Is. 34[6] Jer. 46[10] Ez. 39[17]) signifies a *sacrifice* (cf. also 1 S. 2[13], cited above; and note the art. in הזבח); the sing., "*the* priest," points to the particular priest in attendance on the sacrificer (cf. Lev. 7[33]),—to say nothing of the fact that a law requiring portions of every animal slain, in whatever part of the country, to be sent to the central sanctuary for the consumption of the priests, would evidently be impracticable. (2) Schultz

---

XVIII. 3. מאת] = παρὰ with a gen.: used idiomatically (in preference to מן alone) to express *on the part of*, in reference to the granting of rights, or payment of dues: Gn. 47[22] Ex. 27[21] &c. (*Lex.* II. את **4 b**).—ונתן] lit. "*so* (viz. under the conditions implied in the preceding sentence) he shall give"; but in our idiom simply "he shall give"; cf. Nu. 4[ff.].

(p. 59) and Espin consider that the dues here prescribed are not in lieu of those assigned in Lev. 7^{32-34} (which, it is said, are included in the "fire-offerings" of v.[1]), but *in addition to* them, and perhaps intended as a compensation for the loss sustained by the permission granted in 12^{15} to slaughter for food without sacrifice. But had it been the intention of v.[3] to prescribe something *additional* to what had been usual, this would surely have been indicated more distinctly: as the verse stands ("and this" not "and this *also*") it can only be legitimately understood, like v.[4], as explanatory of v.[1b]. (3) Keil, adopting a modification of (1), supposes the reference to be, not to the peace-offerings properly so called, but to the festal meals held at the central sanctuary, at which firstlings ($12^{17f.}$ 15^{20}), or the substitute for the tithe (14^{26}), were eaten. But the expression "sacrifice the sacrifice" is too general and distinctive to be legitimately limited to such subordinate species of sacrifice as these.

The verse must refer to the commonest kind of the "fire-offerings" named in v.[1], and specify for the people's instruction what parts of these are due to the priest. The only reasonable interpretation is to treat it as *parallel* to Lev. 7^{32-34}, and consequently as fixing the priests' dues at a time when the regulation there laid down was not in force.

1 S. 2^{13-16} shows that in old times the priests received a share of the flesh offered as a "sacrifice": and it is mentioned as an abuse that they (1) claimed whatever pieces their servant, while the sacrifice was boiling, could lift out of the pot with his prong, and (2) demanded further their share of the flesh raw, before the fat was burned and the sacrifice properly completed, in order that they might roast it (which was esteemed a choicer mode of preparing food: cf. Wellh. *Hist.* p. 68). The exact nature of the first abuse is not clear: treated in itself, it might be a demand for something in excess of what was allowed by law—whether the law of Dt. 18^3, or of Lev. 7^{32-34}. But it is not improbable that the passage of Sam. relates to an early stage in the history of sacrifice, when the priest had no legal claim to definite dues of flesh, and the custom was for the worshipper to offer him what he himself chose, or to invite him to the sacrificial feast which, as a matter of course, followed: Eli's sons claimed more than this, and claimed, moreover, to have it when, and as, they pleased. The law of Dt. fixes the priests' dues definitely: at a still later date, they were again fixed upon a new footing (Lev. 7^{32-34}), and a larger and choicer share was allotted to them, viz. the right leg and the breast (cf. Wellh. *l.c.* p. 153 f.).

4. *The first* (fruits) *of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thy oil* (7^{13}), *and the first of the fleece of thy sheep, shalt thou give unto him*] "*i.e.* to the priest, the sing. being retained from v.[3], though here, from the nature of the case, it must be meant collectively" (Di.). The first three items form also part of the revenue of the priests in P (Nu. 18^{12}; cf. 2 Ch. 31^5); the fourth is mentioned only here (so "the first (fruits) of *honey*"

Digitized by Google

are mentioned only 2 Ch. 31^5 [yet cf. Lev. 2^{12}, see v.^{11}]). The offering of first-fruits is an ancient and widely-spread custom: in Israel it is prescribed already in Ex. 23^{19} 34^{26} (JE). Like the tithe, it was a mode of acknowledging Jehovah's bounty in blessing the increase of the earth; and until it had been offered, it was not considered proper to eat of the new fruit of the year, Lev. 23^{17} (cf. further *Rel. Sem.* p. 222 f.). For other allusions to the *rēshith* (lit. *first*; 𝔊 ἀπαρχή) of the year's produce, see $26^{2.4.10}$ (where a liturgical form is prescribed, to accompany its presentation); Lev. 23^{10}; Nu. $15^{20f.}$ (Rom. 11^{16}), Ez. 44^{30} Neh. $10^{38(37)}$ (of coarse meal); Jer. 2^3 (alluded to as sacred), Pr. 3^9 2 Ch. 31^5 Neh. $10^{38(37)}$; Ez. 20^{40} 48^{14} Neh. 12^{44}. On the distinction from *bikkurim*, see Wellh. *Hist.* p. 157 f.—**5.** The reason why the priest is to receive these dues: he is God's specially appointed minister and representative.—*For him hath Jehovah chosen, &c.*] similarly 21^5 1 S. 2^{28}; cf. also 10^8. The sing. (as v.^{4}) is meant collectively: cf. the plur. in the parallel passage, 21^5.—*Out of all thy tribes*] 12^5 (see note): also $29^{20(21)}$ 1 S. 2^{28} (just quoted).—*To stand to minister*] see on 10^9 (p. 123); and cf. 1 K. 8^{11}.—*Him and his sons continually* (4^{40})] the expression points plainly to an hereditary priesthood, though as "priest," the antecedent of the pron., is used collectively (see above), it does not imply necessarily that the priesthood, in the conception of the Writer, is restricted to a particular family in the tribe.

6–8. Provision made for the rights of a Levite coming from the country to officiate at the central sanctuary.—*And if a Levite*—*i.e.* any member of the tribe of Levi—*come from one of thy gates* (15^7 16^5 17^2 $23^{17(16)}$) *out of all Israel*—*i.e.* from any one of the cities ($12^{12.18}$ 14^{27} 16^{11}) of Israel—*where he sojourneth* (Jud. 17^7 19^1), not possessing (v.$^{1a.2a}$) a permanent inheritance, *and come with all the desire of his soul* (12^{15}) *to the place which Jehovah shall choose* (12^5), *and ministers in the name of Jehovah his God* (v.^{5}), *like all his brethren the Levites, which stand there before Jehovah* (10^8), *they shall eat* (v.^{1b}) *like portions*—he shall not be at a disadvantage as compared with those already on the spot, he and they shall share alike in the dues received from the people.—*Besides his sellings according to the fathers*]

Digitized by Google

or "*fathers'* (houses)," *i.e.* families, האבות being an abbreviation for בית האבות (Ex. 6^{25} *al.*). The words are very obscure: they are usually understood to mean "apart from what he has realized by selling the possessions belonging to him in virtue of his family descent" (paraphrased in AV., RV. by "beside that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony")—possessions which, it is supposed, he would part with at the time of leaving the country for the central sanctuary. Dillm. (after J. D. Mich., Schultz) explains, "besides what he has realized by selling the dues (tithe, &c.) rendered to him at his home by particular families." Either explanation is questionable: all that can be said is that the words describe some private source of income possessed by the Levite, distinct from what he receives as a priest officiating at the central sanctuary.

In P, 48 cities are allotted to the tribe for residence (Nu. 35^{1-8} Jos. 21); and the terms of v.[6] are difficult to reconcile with that institution. The "Levites" are represented in this verse, not as resident in their appointed cities, but as "sojourning"—the word (גור) is used of temporary, not of permanent residence—in the cities of Israel without distinction. Hence the institution of Levitical cities cannot well have formed an element in the condition of things contemplated by the present law. To refer v.[6] (Curtiss, *Lev. Priests*, p. 48 f.) to those Levites who have sold their houses and wandered to other cities, involves the improbable regulation that a Levite is not to go directly from a Levitical city to the central sanctuary: he must become a "sojourner" elsewhere first! V.[6] and the allusion in v.[8b] to property owned by Levites, are in no respect incompatible with such an institution, supposing it to have been imperfectly put in force; but the provisions of the law are absolute, they are not limited to the contingency of the regulations of Nu. 35^{1-8} being disobeyed; and it is incredible that, worded as they are, they can have been framed by one who, if the received view of the Pentateuch be correct, had only six months previously assigned to the Levites permanent dwelling-places. Surely, had this been the case, v.[6] would have run, "from one of the cities which I have appointed them (*or* which thou shalt give them)." On the other hand, the representation of v.[6] harmonizes completely with other passages of Dt., in which the country Levites appear (beside the "stranger, the fatherless, and the widow") in a more or less penurious condition, without fixed habitations, and are earnestly commended to the Israelite's charitable benevolence ($12^{12.18.19}$ $14^{27.29}$ $16^{11.14}$ $26^{11.12f.}$).

The truth is, in P and Dt. the tribe of Levi stands upon

8. לבר מִמְכָּרָיו על האבות] מִמְכָּרָיו must come from a subst. מִמְכָּר; but since *apart from, besides*, is לְבַד מִן (not לְבַד alone)—*e.g.* 3^{5}—it is clear that we must vocalize מְמַכָּרָיו (from מַכָּר).

Digitized by Google

two fundamentally different footings. (1) Their *revenues* are different: as has been shown in the notes on 14^{29} 15^{23} 18^{3} they receive in Dt., as compared with P, materially smaller dues in tithes, firstlings, and sacrifices; and, as just said, instead of having cities specially allotted to them, they are represented as homeless and destitute. (2) Their *organization* is different. The term "Levite," it must always be remembered, has in Dt. a different meaning from "Levite" in P. In P it denotes the members of the tribe, *exclusive* of the priests, the descendants of Aaron; in Dt. it denotes *all* members of the tribe, without distinction. The "Levites" of P are inferior members of the tribe, who are assigned various subordinate duties in connexion with the Tabernacle (Nu. 3–4; 18^{1-7}), but are peremptorily forbidden to intrude upon the office of priest (Nu. 4^{20} $16^{7b-11.40}$ 18^{7}). In Dt. this sharp distinction between priests and the common Levites is not recognized; it is implied (18^{1a}) that *all* members of the tribe are qualified to exercise priestly functions: $18^{1b.2b}$ assign to the *whole* tribe the altar-dues reserved in Nu. 18^{20} for the priests alone; and 18^{6-8}, relating to the "Levite" coming from the country to reside at the central sanctuary, describes his services there in terms which elsewhere, when used in a ritual connexion, denote regularly *priestly* duties. Thus, though there is a difference in Dt. between "priest" and "Levite," it is not the difference recognized in P: in P the priests constitute a *fixed* minority of the entire tribe, viz. the descendants of Aaron; in Dt. they are a *fluctuating* minority, viz. those members of the tribe who are officiating for the time at the central sanctuary. Accordingly, in Dt. the distinctive title of the priests is not "sons of *Aaron*," but "sons of *Levi*," or "*Levitical* priests" (see on v.^{1}). Naturally the eldest of the families descended directly from Aaron, which had the custody of the Ark, enjoyed the pre-eminence, and this is recognized in 10^{6}; allied families, also, which had secured a position at the central sanctuary, would doubtless rank above their less fortunate brethren; but no exclusive *right* is recognized in Dt. as belonging to the descendants of Aaron, in contradistinction to other members of the tribe.

Digitized by Google

The position thus assigned to the tribe in Dt. agrees with allusions in the earlier literature; *e.g.* with 1 K. 12^{31}, where it is Jeroboʿam's offence—not as, according to P, it ought to have been, that he made priests who were not of the sons of *Aaron*, but—that he made priests who were not of the sons of *Levi*; and especially with Ez. 44^{10-16}, which implies unambiguously (see *L.O.T.* p. 132 f.), that prior to the age of Ez. the "Levites" generally (*i.e.* Levites in the sense of Dt.) enjoyed the priestly right of sacrificing. Comp. also Ex. 4^{14} (where "the Levite" appears as an official title); and the other occurrences of "Levitical priests," cited on v.[1]. Dt. 10^{8} 21^{5} 33^{8-10}, though they would not in themselves *establish* this view (for it might be said that the tribe, as a whole, was chosen to discharge priestly offices in the persons of a fixed minority who were set apart for the purpose), are, it is plain, perfectly consistent with it. We must, in fact, picture the members of the tribe as scattered in different parts of the land (cf. Gn. 49^{7}); the most prosperous, forming a tolerably close corporation at the Temple of Jerusalem; others, "sojourning" in the country, or finding a home where they could, exactly as is represented in Jud. $17^{7.8}$ 19^{1}, some acting as priests to private families or individuals (*ib.* 17^{10-13} 18^{19}), others officiating at the local sanctuaries (*ib.* $18^{20.27.30}$; and esp. 2 K. 23^{9}), but all dependent for their livelihood, in one way or another, upon what they received from the people. The aim of Dt. 18^{6-8} is to limit the exclusiveness of the Jerusalem priests: it provides that a country Levite, coming to officiate at the central sanctuary, is to share in the dues received there equally with the priests resident on the spot. How far this provision was acted upon by the Jerusalem priests, we do not know: 2 K. 23^{9} shows that, at least after the abolition of the high places by Josiah, the disestablished priests (who yet are styled the "brethren" of those at Jerusalem), though they were allowed the *maintenance* due to them as priests by the law of Dt. 18^{8}, were not admitted to the exercise of priestly functions at the Temple (cf. Ez. 44^{6-14}; and see *L.O.T.* p. 146 f.).

Treated by themselves, the regulations of Dt. might be attributed to the relaxation or neglect of a system once stricter;

Digitized by Google

but in the light of allusions occurring in other books, it is decidedly more probable that, as compared with those of P, they represent the usage of an earlier age; the system of P corresponds to the greater privileges which the priests afterwards acquired, and to the *exclusive* pre-eminence which the family of Aaron ultimately secured for itself. See, further, W. R. Smith, *OTJC.*[2] pp. 358–361, 383 f., more fully *Addit. Answ. to the Libel* (Edinb. 1878), pp. 29–51; Wellh. *Hist.* p. 121 ff.; Baudissin, *AT. Priesterthum*, pp. 78–96, 280–284; Nowack, *Arch.* ii. §§ 88, 89, 94; Kuenen, *Abhandl.* p. 465 ff.

9–22. The position and authority of the Prophet.—All forms of divination and magic are to be eschewed by Israel: the prophet is to take in Israel the place of the heathen soothsayer; and implicit obedience is to be rendered to him. The position assigned in this law to the prophet is a noticeable one. He appears in it as the representative in Israel of the heathen diviner; he is presented as the appointed agent for satisfying, in so far as they are legitimate, those cravings of humanity to unlock the secrets of the future, or to discover in some critical situation—as, for instance, that of Saul before the battle of Gilboaʿ (1 S. $28^{5f.}$)—the purpose of Heaven, which gave birth in other nations to the arts of the diviner, and kindred superstitions. The prophet, as conceived by the Writer, becomes thus a bulwark against the encroachments of heathenism. The other Codes have nothing on the subject of the prophet; but they contain laws which are parallel in part to the prohibitions of v.$^{10f.}$, viz. (in JE) Ex. $22^{17(18)}$ the sorceress, (in H) Lev. 18^{21} 20^{2-5} Molech-worship, 19^{26} observation of omens and soothsaying, 19^{31} $20^{6.27}$ consultation of ghosts and familiar spirits. Here the enumeration is fuller, and seems designed to be practically exhaustive, not less than *nine* superstitious usages being separately specified. How prevalent these practices were in Israel, especially during the period of the Kings, will be apparent from the passages referred to in the notes. A law prohibiting them in detail, and at the same time placing the prophet in his true position in regard to them, would be in entire harmony with the scope of the Deuteronomic legislation.—**9.** *When thou art come into the land, &c.*] as

Digitized by Google

17^{14}.—*The abominations of those nations*] cf. 12^{31}.—**10.** The enumeration of forbidden practices follows. (1) *There shall not be found in thee* (17^{2}) *any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire*] viz. to Molech. The allusions in the OT. are not sufficient to show distinctly either the nature, or the object, of the practice referred to; but it is mentioned here, as the context indicates, not as a form of idolatry, but specifically as a *superstition*, either (Ewald) because it was used for the purpose of obtaining an oracle, or because it was supposed—like the sacrifice of children to Kronos, resorted to by the Phœnicians and Carthaginians at times of grave national danger or calamity (Porphyry *ap.* Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* iv. 64. 4; Diod. Sic. xx. 14)—to possess extraordinary efficacy in averting calamity (comp. 2 K. 3^{27}). The practice is prohibited in emphatic terms in H, Lev. 18^{21} 20^{2-5}; it is alluded to, c. 12^{31}, as a climax of Canaanite enormity; and mention is frequently made of it as prevalent, esp. in Judah, from the time of Aḥaz, 2 K. 16^{3} (in imitation of the Canaanites), 17^{17} (in Israel, in the compiler's summary of the history of the N. kingdom), 21^{6} (Manasseh: cf. Mic. 6^{7}) 23^{10} (put down by Josiah), Jer. 32^{35} (cf. 7^{31} 19^{5} [omit "for burnt-offerings to Baʿal," with 𝔊; Smith, *Rel. Sem.* p. 353]), Ez. 20^{31} 23^{37} (cf. $16^{20f.}$ Is. 57^{5}). The standing expression used to describe it is "to cause to pass through the fire" (העביר באשׁ), 2 K. 16^{3} 17^{17} 21^{6} 23^{10} Ez. 20^{31}, with באשׁ omitted Lev. 18^{21} Jer. 32^{35} Ez. 16^{21} 23^{37}, cf. 20^{26}, with "to Molech" added Lev. 18^{21} 2 K. 23^{10} Jer. 32^{35}.

It must have been more than a mere ceremony of lustration, or consecration by fire, to Molech, for the word "burn" is used in Jer. 7^{31} 19^{5}, cf. Dt. 12^{31}; on the other hand, the view, adopted by many modern writers, on the strength of the term "slain" (Ez. 16^{21} 23^{39}, cf. Is. 57^{5} Ps. 106^{38}), that the victims were put to death first, and burnt upon a pyre or altar afterwards, hardly accounts for the use of the peculiar and characteristic expression "to cause to pass through the fire." It would be in better agreement with this expression to suppose that the rite in question was a kind of *ordeal*, in which, for instance, an omen was derived from observing whether the victim passed through the flames unscathed or not, or which was resorted to for the purpose of securing good fortune. The spot at which the rite was principally carried on was the "valley (גֵּיא) of the son of Hinnom," on the S. side of Jerusalem (2 K. 23^{10} Jer. 7^{31} 19^{6} 32^{35}):

Digitized by Google

the horrible associations connected with it (cf. the allusion in Is. 66^{24}) gave rise to that application of the name which meets us in the גֵּיהִנֹּם of the later Jews, the γέεννα of the NT.

The name *Molech* (Lev. 18^{21} 20^{2-5} 1 K. 11^{7} 2 K. 23^{10} Jer. 32^{35}†—always, except 1 K. 11^{7}, with the art. הַמֹּלֶךְ: 𝔊 usu. Μολοχ) is properly an appellative (hence the art., as in הַבַּעַל) meaning *the King*. Very probably it ought to be vocalized *Milk*. It is true, the name, as that of a god, has not hitherto been found in Inscriptions; but it forms part of many proper names, which, when transliterated into Greek or Latin exhibit this form (*e.g.* מלכיתן, "Milk has given,"=Μιλκιαθων-ος, *CIS.* I. i. 89; see more fully Baethgen, *Sem. Rel.* p. 37). It is thought by many that the vowels of מֹלֶךְ are intended to suggest the Heb. word בֹּשֶׁת *shameful thing* (Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 301; *ZATW.* 1883, p. 124; Smith, *Rel. Sem.* 353; Baethgen, *l.c.* p. 38 *n.*; Stade, *Gesch.* i. 610; König, *Einl.* 85). The many Phœnician names compounded with *Milk* show that the god was worshipped particularly by the Phœnicians, both in their mother-country and in their colonies, Cyprus, Carthage, &c. (Baethgen, pp. 37–40). Cf. the similar worship of Adrammelech and 'Anammelech (2 K. 17^{31}). The name of the 'Ammonite god *Milcom* (1 K. $11^{5.33}$ *al.*) is derived from the same root, but the form is different; and the two deities are probably not to be identified: at Jerusalem they were worshipped at different spots (2 K. $23^{9.13}$); and 1 K. 11^{7} מלך (without the art.; see above) is probably a mere clerical error for מלכם [𝔊 τῷ βασιλεῖ αὐτῶν=מַלְכָּם, as v.^{33}]; cf. v.$^{5.33}$. See, further, W. R. Smith, *Encycl. Brit.*^{9} *s.v.*; *Rel. Sem.* pp. 352–357, 375 f.; *PRE.*^{2} *s.v.* (with the reff., p. 177); Stade, *Gesch.* i. 609 f.; Baethgen, *l.c.* pp. 15, 37–40, 84, 237; Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 168–170.

There follow *three* terms descriptive of various methods of divination, *two* denoting different forms of magic, and *three* relating to various modes of consulting the world of spirits. On the terms employed see especially the study of W. R. Smith on "The forms of divination and magic in Dt. $18^{10.11}$" in the *JPh.* xiii. 273 ff., xiv. 113 ff.; and on analogous superstitions in ancient Arabia, Wellhausen, *Reste Arabischen Heidentumes*, pp. 135–153. (2) *Or one that obtaineth oracles* (קֹסֵם קְסָמִים)] properly, as Arabic shows, the term means to obtain an oracle from a god by some method of drawing lots. In Heb. it is the word most commonly used to express the idea of *divining* in general.

In Arabic (Ges. *Thes. s.v.*; Smith, *JPh.* xiii. 273 ff.; Wellh. *Arab. Heid.* pp. 126–128, 167) *qasama, to divide, distribute* (Gn. 32^{7} Saad.), has in conj. x (*'istaqsama*) the sense of *to get a part allotted to oneself*, and is used in particular of procuring a divine decision, or award, by drawing lots at a sanctuary, with headless arrows (*'azlām*, Qor 5^{4}); the arrows, inscribed with the possible alternatives contemplated, were placed in a quiver, and whirled about, and the one which first fell out was supposed to express

Digitized by Google

the decision of the god. The heathen Arabs often resorted to this mode of divination before any important or uncertain undertaking, and especially before a campaign. In the OT. an extremely similar procedure is ascribed poetically by Ez. to Nebuchadnezzar, who is represented ($21^{26f.(21f.)}$) as standing where the roads to Jerusalem and Rabbah of the 'Ammonites diverge, and consulting the idol (שאל בתרפים) by shaking the arrows to and fro (קלקל בחצים), for the purpose of determining which he shall attack first: he holds in his right hand the result of his inquiry הקסם ירושלם, "the oracle 'Jerusalem,'" *i.e.* the arrow marked "Jerusalem." The passage supports the conjecture that the *Teraphim* were employed in this form of divination: the two are also mentioned together in 1 S. 15^{23} Zech. 10^{2}. Elsewhere in the OT. the word (verb or subst.) occurs v.[14] Nu. 22^{7} 23^{23} (both JE), Jos. 13^{22} (P: of Bala'am), 1 S. 6^{2} (among the Philistines), 28^{8} (of divination בָּאוֹב; see below, No. 7), 2 K. 17^{17} Pr. 16^{10} קֶסֶם על שפתי מלך במשפט לא ימעל פיו (*i.e.* the king's decisions have the character and value of a divine oracle), Is. 3^{2} Mic. $3^{6.7.11}$ Jer. 14^{14} 27^{9} 29^{8} Ez. 12^{24} $13^{6.7.9.23}$ $21^{34(29)}$ 22^{28} Is. 44^{25}†. In most of the passages from the prophets, it is used disparagingly of the oracles given by "false" prophets. 𝔊 usu. represents by the general terms μάντις, μαντεύομαι, μαντεία, μαντεῖον.

(3) *Or a soothsayer* (מְעוֹנֵן)] this species of divination is alluded to besides in v.[14] Lev. 19^{26} Jud. 9^{37} (אלון מעוננים the "Soothsayers' Terebinth"), 2 K. 21^{6} = 2 Ch. 33^{6} (practised by Manasseh), Is. 2^{6} (the Philistines noted for it), Mic. 5^{11} Jer. 27^{9} Is. 57^{3}†. The etymology is obscure; and the precise kind of divination intended is uncertain. (4) *Or one that observeth omens* (מְנַחֵשׁ)] Gn. $44^{5.15}$ (of Joseph's divination with the "cup," *i.e.* probably by hydromancy, or watching the play of light in a cup of liquid), Lev. 19^{26} 2 K. 17^{17} 21^{6} (= 2 Ch. 33^{6}):

10. מעונן] Ar. *ghanna* is to *emit a hoarse nasal sound*; whence Smith supposes that מעונן may have denoted properly the *murmurer*, or *hoarsely humming soothsayer*: "the characteristic utterance of the Arabic soothsayer is the monotonous rhythmical croon called *saj'*, properly the cooing of a dove; and a low murmur, *zamzamah*, or whisper, *waswasah*, is similarly ascribed to the *Kâhin*," or seer.—מנחש] the meaning *hiss*, or *whisper* (Ges.) for נחש is very insufficiently supported: more prob. (Bochart) the word is a denom. from נחש *serpent*, the belief being a widespread one in antiquity that the power of divination, or of understanding the prophetic speech of birds, was obtained by the aid of serpents, though it is some objection to this view that "while נחש *to divine* seems to be common to all the Sem. languages, נחש *serpent* is peculiar to Heb." (Smith). In Arab. the root is applied in a bad sense (cf. *ominous*): *naḥisa*, to *be inauspicious* or *unlucky*.—מכשף] the deriv. is uncertain. One meaning of Ar. *kasafa* is to *cut; kisf* is a *piece* or *fragment* (Qor. 17^{94} 52^{44} *al.*); whence Smith conjectures that כשפים may have denoted primarily the "herbs or other drugs *shredded* into a magic brew."

Digitized by Google

the verb is also used in the derived sense of *take* or *observe as an omen*, *augur*, Gn. 30[27] 1 K. 20[33]†. The cognate subst. נחשׁ occurs Nu. 23[23]; 24[1] (of the omens which Balaʿam sought on the hill tops). In Syriac the word means divination "from signs that consist in words, or actions, or the cries of birds, or fire, or atmospheric changes, or rain, or the [astrological] complexion of the times, and the like, from which it is inferred that one thing is good and another bad, and that a man should push on or desist accordingly" (Smith, p. 114; PS. col. 2340, 2341). Probably the Heb. term denoted similarly all those species of divination from natural omens, of which the most familiar example is divination by the flight of birds (οἰωνός, οἰωνίζομαι; *augurium*, *auspicium*: cf. Ar. *taʿayyafa*, *taṭayyara*, Wellh. *Arab. Heid.* 148 f.).

We pass now from methods of divination to those of magic or sorcery. (5) *Or a sorcerer* (מְכַשֵּׁף)] this species of magic is mentioned Ex. 7[11] (in Egypt), 22[17] (the *sorceress* [fem.] not to be permitted to live), Mal. 3[5] 2 Ch. 33[6] Dan. 2[2]†: כַּשָּׁפִים *sorcerers* are named Jer. 27[9]†; the subst. כְּשָׁפִים 2 K. 9[22] Mic. 5[11] ("And I will cut off sorceries out of thy hand"), Nah. 3[4] (in Nineveh), Is. 47[9. 12] (in Babylon)†. Mic. 5[11] appears to show that כשפים were something *material*, such as drugs, herbs, spells, &c., used superstitiously for the purpose of producing magical effects (𝔊 usually φάρμακα). מְכַשֵּׁף will mean accordingly *enchanter* or *sorcerer*.—11. (6) *Or a charmer* (חֹבֵר חָבֶר)] so Ps. 58[6] (חוֹבֵר חֲבָרִים מְחֻכָּם) in parallelism with מְלַחֲשִׁים *whisperers*, *i.e.* serpent-charmers: חֲבָרִים, also (by the side of כְּשָׁפִים), Is. 47[9. 12] (of Babylon)†. The expression may signify properly *one who ties* magic *knots*, or binds by a spell (cf. καταδέω), or (Smith) *one who composes spells* or *incantations*. (7) and (8) *Or one that consulteth a ghost or a familiar spirit* (שֹׁאֵל אוֹב וְיִדְּעֹנִי)] the אוֹב (pl. אֹבוֹת) is mentioned besides in Lev. 19[31]* 20[6*. 27*] 1 S. 28[3*. 9*] (put down by Saul),[7] (אשת בעלת אוב "a woman commanding ghosts"),[8] Is. 8[19]* 19[3]* (in Egypt), 29[4] 2 K. 21[6]* = 2 Ch. 33[6]* (ועשה אוב וידעונים, of Manasseh, "and instituted ghosts and familiar spirits," *i.e.* persons professing to deal with them), 23[24]* (put down by Josiah), 1 Ch. 10[13]†; the ידעני, always by the side of the אוב, in the passages marked *.

Digitized by Google

From Lev. 20[27] ("a man or a woman, *when there is in them* an *ōb* or a *yidde'ōni*") it appears that an *ōb* was considered to declare itself *in* the body of the person who had to do with it: Is. 29[4] shows further that the oracles of an *ōb* were uttered in a twittering voice, which seemed to rise from the ground: the narrative of the witch of 'Endor shows (1 S. 28[3b. 11]) that those who followed the art professed the power of calling up from the underworld the ghosts of the dead. 𝔖 renders by *zakkuro*, *i.e.* a ghost, speaking ostensibly either from the underworld, or from the stomach of the soothsayer (see PS. col. 1122; Nöld. *ZDMG.* 1874, p. 667). 𝔊 nearly always represents אוֹב by ἐγγαστρίμυθοι = ventriloquists. This rendering no doubt contains the true explanation of the operation of the אוב: the בעלת אוב "pretends to see a ghost which she describes, but her dupes only hear a voice which by ventriloquism seems to come from the ground." The אוב may be fairly represented by the English *ghost.* In what respect the *yidde'ōni* differed from the *ōb* is uncertain. The word is usually understood to signify *knower* (i.e. *wise spirit*: Ewald, *vielwisserisch*); but W. R. Smith suggests the meaning *acquaintance.* Whether this etymology be accepted or not, the *yidde'ōni* may be not unreasonably understood of a "familiar" spirit, *i.e.* a spirit which is at the beck and call of a particular person (cf. Acts 16[16]), and imparts to him of its superior knowledge. By the Arabs such a spirit is called *ra'iyy*, the "jinn" who *shows himself* to a soothsayer, guiding him in the practice of his art, his companion and attendant.

There is thus a distinction between the אוב and the ידעוני: those who divine by the former profess (1 S. 28[11]) to call up any ghost; those who divine by the latter consult only the particular spirit which is their "familiar." (The AV. of ידעוני "wizard" appears to be incorrect: see Lev. 20[27], quoted above. Here *ōb* and *yidde'ōni* are both the objects of "consulteth," as in Is. 8[19] of "inquire of.") (9) *Or one that inquireth of the dead* (דֹּרֵשׁ אֶל הַמֵּתִים)] "to inquire of the dead" is in Is. 8[19] either synonymous with, or at least includes, the consultation of אֹבוֹת and ידענים. Whether any particular method of necromancy is denoted by it, is doubtful: more probably it is a comprehensive term, intended to bring within the terms of the prohibition whatever other forms of the same superstition, not already mentioned, were in vogue: for instance, the practice of "incubation," or passing the night in tombs (cf. Is. 65[4]), or the establishment, at particular spots, of oracles of the dead (νεκυομαντεῖα).—12. *An abomination unto Jehovah*] on 7[25].—*Because of these abominations is Jehovah dispossessing* (4[38] 9[5]), *&c.*] cf. Lev. 18[24ff.] 20[23], where, however, the "abominations," on account of which the Canaanites are

Digitized by Google

expelled, are, all but entirely, various forms of immorality, not, as here, superstitious practices.—13–14. Israel's duty, on the contrary, is to be blameless and without reproach in its converse with its God: it is not to adopt practices which are heathenish in their tendency, and which would be a blemish upon the character which Jehovah demands of it.—13. *Thou shalt be perfect with Jehovah thy God*] *perfect* (תָּמִים), as Gn. 17^{1} Ps. $18^{26\,(25)}$ *al.*, implying without blemish (comp. the physical application of the same word, noticed on 17^{1}), disfigured by no imperfection or unsoundness. The idea expressed by תמים is not quite the same as that of שָׁלֵם (1 K. 8^{61} 11^{4} *al.*), though this is represented in AV. RV. by the same English equivalent: תמים denotes a person without moral blemish, שלם (always in this connexion used with reference to the *heart*) implies one whose heart is devoted *wholly* to a single object.—*With* (עם)] *i.e. in dealing* or *in converse with*, almost *towards*: comp. Ps. $18^{24\,(23)}$ (ואהיה תמים עמו) $^{26f.\,(25f.)}$; so with שָׁלֵם 1 K. 8^{61} 11^{4} &c.—14. *Possess*] 12^{2}.—*But as for thee, not so hath Jehovah thy God granted unto thee*] *i.e.* such practices are not in accordance with His appointment, or intention, so far as Israel is concerned.—15–18. Israel is to be provided, as occasion may arise, with a prophet, who will act on God's behalf, and communicate to them, so far as may be needful, His will.—15. *A prophet will Jehovah thy God raise up unto thee*] viz. as occasion may demand (cf. Jud. $2^{16.\,18}$), the sing. denoting Moses' representative for the time being. The context shows that no single, or particular, prophet can be intended: it was a constantly recurring need which prompted the heathen to resort to diviners for the purpose of unlocking the secrets of the future; and as the prophet is to supply the place of such diviners in Israel, it must be a similarly recurring need which (so far as Jehovah permits it) he is designed to satisfy. It follows that the reference here is to a permanent institution, not to a particular individual prophet (see p. 229). —*From the midst of thee, from thy brethren*] in contrast to the diviners, who were often of foreign origin (comp. v.[14] Nu. $22^{5f.}$ Is. 2^{6}). Sam. 𝔊 read "from the midst of thy brethren" (מקרב אחיך), as v.[18].—*Like unto me*] the context limits the sense

Digitized by Google

in which this expression is intended. It is not that the promised prophet is to be "like" Moses in every respect, or in other words to be *equal* with him: he is to be like him, as v.$^{16-18}$ show, in the *fact* of being Jehovah's representative with the people, but not necessarily in being His representative in the same *degree* in which Moses was: as Keil points out, the terms of his commission in v.^{18} ("I will put my words in his mouth," &c.) do not express the special form of revelation which, according to Nu. 12^{6-8} Dt. 34^{10}, distinguished Moses from other prophets, but only the form which was common to prophets generally (Jer. 1^{7-9}: cf. on v.^{18}).—*To him shall ye hearken*] unlike the nations of Canaan, who (v.^{14}) "hearkened" to soothsayers and oracle-mongers.—**16–18.** In appointing the prophet as the authorized exponent of His will, Jehovah is but responding to the people's own request, preferred by them at Ḥoreb ($5^{20-28\,(23-31)}$).—*The day of the assembly*] 9^{10} 10^4.—*I will no more hear, &c.*] cf. $5^{21f.\,(24f.)}$. Not "*let me* not hear" (RV.), which would require אַל.—**17.** *They have well said that which they have spoken*] as $5^{25\,(28)}$,—the first part of Jehovah's answer being here omitted.—**18.** The answer in $5^{28\,(31)}$ is worded differently, the commission being limited to Moses himself: the two declarations are not, however, contradictory, but mutually supplement each other; there it is Moses who is to speak on God's behalf, here it is Moses' representative in the future.—*And I will put* (ונתתי) *my words in his mouth*] Jer. 1^9 5^{14} (comp. $23^{28f.}$ Ez. $3^{4.\,10f.}$ &c.): more commonly with שִׂים, Nu. 22^{38} $23^{5.\,12.\,16}$ (of Bala'am); Is. 51^{16} 59^{21} (both of Israel, under its ideal character, as the organ of divine revelation); comp. also, for the idiom, Ex. 4^{15} 2 S. $14^{3.\,19}$ Ezr. 8^{17}. The idea is of course not substantially different from that expressed by such phrases as נְאֻם יהוה, "Thus saith Jehovah," "The word of Jehovah came unto . . .," so frequent in the writings of the canonical prophets.—*And he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him*] comp. Ex. 7^2 Jer. $1^{7.\,17}$.

The *exclusively* Messianic reference of v.$^{15-18}$, adopted by many of the older expositors (cf. Acts $3^{22f.}$ 7^{37}), is inconsistent with the context; and has been deservedly abandoned by the great majority of modern com-

16. מעם] 10^{12}. —**17.** היטיבו אשר דברו] 5^{25}: cf. Gn. 44^5 הרעתם אשר עשיתם, Jer. 38^9.

Digitized by Google

mentators and theologians (including, for instance, Hengst. *Christology*, i. 112ff., Keil, Espin, Oehler, *OT. Theol.* § 161, Orelli, *OT. Proph.* p. 132 f., König, *Offenb. des AT.s*, ii. 131). The promised prophet is to meet a *continuous* and *permanent* need of the people, after they are settled in Canaan (v.^{9}): he is to supersede the necessity either of God's addressing Israel directly Himself (v.$^{16-18}$), or of Israel's having recourse, like their neighbours, to the arts of divination (v.$^{14f.}$); and a criterion is even added enabling the Israelite to distinguish the true prophet from the false (v.$^{21f.}$). The argument of the passage shows that the "prophet" contemplated is not a single individual, belonging to a distant future, but *Moses' representative for the time being*, whose office it would be to supply Israel, whenever in its history occasion should arise, with needful guidance and advice: in other words, that the reference is not to an individual prophet, but to a *prophetical order*. The existence of such an order in Israel, forming a permanent channel of revelation, was, of course, a signal mark of distinction between Israel and other nations of antiquity. At the same time the terms of the description are such that it may be reasonably understood as *including* a reference to the ideal prophet, Who should be "like" Moses in a pre-eminent degree, in Whom the line of individual prophets should culminate, and Who should exhibit the characteristics of the prophet in their fullest perfection (so Hengst., Keil, Espin, *al.*).

19–20. The office of the prophet, as Jehovah's representative, is a high one, which claims obedience on the part of those who hear him, but which, if abused or exercised wrongfully, entails a strict retribution upon the offender.—*Hearken unto my words*] Jer. 29^{19} 35^{13}.—*I* (emph.) *will require it of him*] *i.e.* I will exact punishment of him for it (see below).—**20.** *The prophet who shall act presumptuously* (17^{12}) *in speaking a word in my name*, (even) *that which I have not commanded him to speak*] the sin of "speaking falsely in Jehovah's name" may be readily illustrated from the book of Jeremiah: *e.g.* Jer. 14^{14-15} $23^{16.\,21-27.\,30-33}$ $27^{9f.\,14-16}$ 28^{15-17} $29^{8f.\,21-32}$ 37^{19}; see also 1 K. $22^{11f.\,23}$ Ez. 12^{24} 13^{1-23} Lam. 2^{14} (Jer.'s phrase in this connexion is usually נִבָּא שֶׁקֶר, Ez.'s שָׁוְא (חָזוֹן) חָזָה). To judge from the passages quoted, such prophecies were mostly prompted by the desire for popularity (cf. Is. 30^{10} Mic. 2^{11} 3^{11}): the prophets whom Jer. opposed preached "peace when there was no peace" (6^{13b-14}), they led the people on to false tracks by elating them with vain hopes of affluence, freedom from invasion, a speedy return from exile, &c.—*Or who shall speak in*

19. אדרש מעמו] will *require*, or *exact*, it of him (23^{22}): here with the collat. idea of punishing; so with פָּקַד פ' Gn. 9^{5} Ez. 33^{6} 34^{10}.—**20.** לדבר דבר בשמי את אשר ל'] render as above. The indef. דבר is at once more closely defined

Digitized by Google

the name of other gods] two classes of false prophets are thus distinguished, those who falsely (and deliberately, not through self-deception) claim to speak in Jehovah's name, and those who claim to speak in the name of "other gods": both agree in that they affirm a divine origin for the imaginations of their own heart.—**21–22.** The prophet who comes forward in the name of other gods is condemned *ipso facto* (cf. $13^{6\,(5)}$): for distinguishing the false from the true prophet of Jehovah, a criterion is given; the prediction which does not come to pass has not Jehovah for its author.—**21.** *And if thou say in thy heart, How* (איכה) . . . ?] 7^{17}.—**22.** *If the thing follow not, nor come to pass*] the cases contemplated are therefore such as belong to the near future, the failure, or accomplishment, of which can be ascertained without material difficulty or delay. Cf. Jer. 28^{9}.—*Thou shalt not stand in awe* (1^{17}) *of him*] in strong contrast to the attitude demanded in presence of the true prophet (v.^{19}). There is no occasion either to regard him with deference, or to shrink from pronouncing sentence against him (v.^{20}).

The statement of the criteria for distinguishing true and false prophecy, contained in these verses, is manifestly incomplete. The case of the fulfilment of a prediction uttered in the interest of "other gods" has, it is true, been dealt with previously ($13^{3f.\,(2f.)}$); but the case of the fulfilment of a prediction alleged falsely to have been uttered in the name of Jehovah is not noticed. Nor is any consideration given to the still more important case, which nevertheless, as Jeremiah expressly teaches (18^{7-10}), is liable to occur, of the non-fulfilment of a prediction uttered truly in Jehovah's name, in consequence of a moral change in the character of those to whom it is addressed, or even as the result of an effectual intercession, addressed to Jehovah on their behalf (comp. Jer. 26^{19}; also Ex. 32^{14} Am. 5^{15} $7^{3.\,6}$ Joel $2^{13f.\,18}$ Jonah $3^{9f.}$). Probably, however, the occurrence of cases such as these would be otherwise made apparent. The law contemplates a case both more likely to occur and more difficult to detect. Cf. Schultz, *OT. Theol.* i. 257–263.

XIX., XXI. 1–9. *Criminal Law.*

XIX. 1–13. The Cities of Refuge. In Canaan three cities are to be set apart as a refuge for any one who has killed his

by the definite obj., with את: Gn. 26^{34} Jud. 3^{15} (ויקם י׳ להם מושיע את אהוד) 1 K. $11^{14.\,19}$ 16^{31} Is. 7^{6} 8^{2} &c.—ומת הנביא ההוא] the sentence is formulated exactly as 17^{12}.—**22.** אשר] either "when" (Ges.), as Jos. 4^{21} (*Lex.* אשר **8 d**); or "that which . . " (Dillm.)

Digitized by Google

neighbour accidentally, and three more, if Israel's border be extended to the full limits promised.—The law is the expansion, and at the same time the accommodation to a later historical situation, of the briefer law contained in the "Book of the Covenant," Ex. 21^{12-14}. There it is said that Jehovah will appoint an asylum for him who has slain a man by accident, but that the wilful murderer is to be taken from His altar that he may die. From the context it appears to follow that the asylum of v.^{13} is the altar of v.^{14} (in agreement with 1 K. 1^{50} 2^{28}); but in Dt. fixed cities are appointed for the purpose, and regulations for their use are laid down. P has a law on the same subject, Nu. 35^{9-34}, the provisions of which, while considerably fuller and more minute than those in Dt., and differing remarkably in expression, agree (so far as they cover common ground) in substance. The technical term "Cities of Refuge" (עָרֵי מִקְלָט), used in Numbers, is not found in Dt. The actual appointment of the Cities of Refuge is ascribed by P to Joshua (Jos. 20), though according to the present text of Dt. the three trans-Jordanic cities had been appointed by Moses, 4^{41-43} (cf. p. 78).—**1.** *When Jehovah thy God cutteth off the nations*] *verbatim* as 12^{29a}.—*And thou possessest them, &c.*] cf. 12^{29c}; also $6^{10f.}$.—**2.** *Separate*] 4^{41}.—*Three cities*] see Jos. 20^{7} (P).—**3.** *Thou shalt prepare thee the way*] in order, namely, that the cities may be safely and rapidly reached from all parts of the land.—*Divide . . . into three parts*] so that each city may form the centre of a corresponding district.—**4–6.** The circumstances under which the cities thus appointed may be applied for the benefit of the manslayer.—**4.** *Unawares* (בִּבְלִי דַעַת)] lit. *without knowledge*: so 4^{42} Jos. $20^{3.5}$ (D^2); not so elsewhere. In the law of P, the idea is expressed by a different word, viz. בִּשְׁגָגָה lit. *in error*, *i.e.* inadvertently (RV. unwittingly), Nu. $35^{11.15}$ Jos. $20^{3.9}$ (the technical expression used regularly by P, as Lev. $4^{2.22}$ Nu. $15^{24.26-29}$ *al.*).—*And he hated him not in time past*] cf. Nu. 35^{23b}.—**5.** The case of accidental homicide illustrated by an example (cf. Nu. $35^{22f.}$).—*And whoso goeth*] "*as when* one goeth" is a probable emendation, but the text cannot be so rendered:

XIX. 4. . . . וזה דבר] 15^{2}.—והוא לא שׂנא לו] on 4^{42}.

Digitized by Google

see below.—*Fetcheth a stroke*] a very idiomatic rendering of נִדְּחָה (lit. *is driven, impelled*): cf. the active "impel" in 20^{19} (AV. *wield*).—*And live*] acc. to the Deut. insertion (*L.O.T.* p. 105) in Jos. 20 (v.$^{4f.}$) he is to state his case at the gate of the city to its elders, who are then formally to receive him into it.—**6.** *Lest the avenger of blood pursue the manslayer, while his heart is hot*] *i.e.* lest the nearest kinsman of the person who has been killed (in whom, according to ancient usage, was vested the right, and the duty, of avenging his blood) pursue the manslayer, while his feelings are aroused (cf. Ps. 39^4) and he is not sufficiently calm to reflect that it was an accident. The "avenger of blood" (גֹּאֵל הַדָּם) is named also 2 S. 14^{11} (cf. $^{6.7}$) Nu. 35^{19-27} Jos. $20^{3.5.9}$. גָּאַל, as said above (on 7^8), is *to enforce a claim*: blood shed wrongfully calls for justice (Gn. 4^{10}); and the גֹּאֵל הַדָּם is the one who enforces this claim upon the murderer, and so vindicates the rights of the murdered man, *i.e.* he is the "avenger of blood."—**8–10.** If Israel's territory be enlarged to the ideal limits promised (1^7 $11^{23f.}$), three additional cities are to be set apart for the same purpose.—**8.** *Enlarge thy border, &c.*] 12^{20}.—*As he sware, &c.*] cf. Ex. 23^{31} 34^{24}.—*All the land which he promised, &c.*] see on $1^{7\,end}$ ("to the Euphrates").—**9.** The condition of this expansion of Israel's territory, viz. Israel's devotion to the service of its God. Comp. 11^{22-24}. The first part of the verse, introduced by כִּי, enunciates a condition subordinate to v.^{8}: *then thou shalt add* is the apodosis to *And if* (וְאִם), v.^{8}. See phil. note on 12^{20}.—*To love*] 6^5.—*To walk in his ways*] 8^6.—**10.** *That innocent blood be not shed, &c.*] as it would be, if a man, not guilty of deliberate murder, were slain by the avenger of blood. "Innocent blood," as 21^8 27^{25} Jer. 7^6 *al.*: comp.

4b–5. "He that smiteth . . ., and he that goeth . . ., *he* shall flee," &c. But prob. כַּאֲשֶׁר *as when* should be read for ואשר *and he that* in v.^{5}; for v.^{5a} seems clearly intended not to annex a fresh case, but to *illustrate* v.^{4b}.—**5.** ואשר יבא . . . ונדחה וג'] Gn. $24^{14.43}$ &c. (Dr. § 115, *s.v.* אשר).—**6.** כי ירבה הדרך] cf. 14^{24}.—והכהו נפש] lit. "and smite him *as regards* (the) *soul*" (*i.e.* the life: on 12^{23}): so v.^{11} Gn. 37^{21} Jer. $40^{14.15}$ (paraphrased in A.V. "take his (thy) life"); cf. Dt. 22^{26} ורצחו נפש (G-K. § 117. 5^d).—ולו אין משפט מות] lit. "and he had no case of death," *i.e.* he was guilty of no capital offence: so Jer. $26^{11.16}$. Cf. Dt. 21^{22} lit. "when there is in a man a sin, a *case of death* (*i.e.* a capital crime)."—**10.** ולא ישפך . . . והיה] as 7^{25}.—**11.** האל] 4^{42}.

Digitized by Google

v.[13].—*Is giving thee, &c.*] 4^{21}.—*And blood be upon thee*] cf. 2 S. 21^1 (reading, with 𝔊, "upon Saul and upon his house there is blood [ואל בֵּיתֹה דמים]"); also 2 S. 16^8 Hos. 12^{15}.

The meaning of these verses will depend upon the view taken of 4^{41-43}. If 4^{41-43} was placed where it now stands by the author of Dt., the three trans-Jordanic Cities of Refuge will be presupposed here; and, v.$^{2-7}$ referring to the three cities in Canaan, v.$^{8-10}$ will contemplate three others (making *nine* in all), to be added in case Israel's territory reach the limits promised in 1^7 $11^{23f.}$. If, on the contrary, 4^{41-43} is a subsequent insertion in Dt., and the appointment of the three trans-Jordanic cities by Moses is antedated (cf. p. 78), then only *six* cities in all will be contemplated by D, three in Canaan v.$^{2-7}$, and three on the E. of Jordan v.$^{8-10}$ (Wellh. *Comp.* 207; Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.* 337). The terms of v.^{8} favour the first of these alternatives; at the same time it is remarkable, if it be correct, that no allusion is made, even in v.^{9b}, to the three cities E. of Jordan, already (according to Dt. 4^{41-43}) appointed.

11–13. But the privilege of asylum is not to be extended to the murderer, who, if he flees to one of these cities, is to be delivered up, without compunction, to justice. Comp. Ex. 21^{14}; and more fully (P) Nu. 35^{16-21} (where different cases of intentional homicide are illustrated).—**11.** *Rise up against him*] Gn. 4^8.—**12.** *The elders of his city*] cf. $21^{2-4.\,6.\,19f.}$ 22^{15-18} 25^{7-9}; and in D² Jos. 20^4.

The "elders" figure in almost every period of Israelitish history. Thus they appear sometimes as the official representatives of the people generally, acting on their behalf on important occasions, accompanying or conferring with Moses, Joshua, or the king, &c. (*e.g.* Ex. $3^{16.\,18}$ 4^{29} $24^{1.\,14}$; Dt. $5^{20\,(23)}$ 27^1 $29^{9\,(10)}$ $31^{9.\,28}$ Jos. 7^6 24^1 1 S. 4^3 8^4 2 S. 3^{17} 5^3 1 K. $8^{1.\,3}$ $20^{7f.}$); sometimes as the leading inhabitants or representatives of a particular district or city, as Jud. 8^{14} (Succoth), 11^{5-11} (Gile'ad), 1 S. 11^3 (Jabesh), 16^4 (Bethleḥem), 30^{26} and 2 S. $19^{12\,(11)}$ (Judah), 1 K. $21^{8.\,11}$ (Jezreel), 2 K. $10^{1.\,5}$ (Samaria), who constitute the local authority, by whom, for instance, a royal commission is executed, or public business affecting the locality is transacted. In Dt. they are represented as exercising *judicial* functions (cf. on 16^{18}), especially in the trial of capital charges, and cases affecting the rights of the family: comp. Ru. $4^{2.\,4.\,9}$ 1 K. $21^{8.\,11}$ Ezr. 10^4. Is. $3^{2.\,14}$ $9^{14\,(15)}$ also illustrate their official *status*, and the duties expected of them.

And deliver him, &c.] the avenger of blood is specified in Nu. 35^{19-21} as the person authorized to put the murderer to death: but the particular case of the murderer, after he has fled to a city of refuge, being fetched thence and delivered up to him by the elders of his own city, is not there contemplated.

Digitized by Google

13. *Thine eye shall not pity him*] 7^{16}.—*Thou shalt exterminate* ($13^{6\,(5)}$) *innocent blood from Israel*] blood innocently shed, so long as it is unavenged, is a stain upon a land (Nu. 35^{33}); by the death of the murderer the stain is removed (cf. 21^{9}).—*And it shall be well for thee* (וטוב לך)] $5^{30\,(33)}$.

In many countries a money-compensation (a *ποινή*, or *wergild*) is accepted by the relatives of a murdered man, as a satisfaction for his life (see *e.g.* Hom. *Il.* $18^{498ff.}$; Tac. *Germ.* 21; among the Saxons, Freeman, *Compar. Politics*, 275–278). But in Hebrew law no such compromise is permitted: murder can be atoned for only by the blood of the murderer (Ex. 21^{12} in JE; Lev. 24^{17} in H; Dt. $19^{11\text{-}13}$; Gn. $9^{5f.}$ Nu. $35^{31\text{-}33}$ in P): a כֹּפֶר, or "ransom," is permitted only in the case of a man being killed by an animal (Ex. 21^{30}).

The "avenger of blood" figures in many primitive or semi-primitive societies. In a completely civilized society, the right of punishment is assumed by the State: for the revenge that might be inflicted in haste or passion (Dt. 19^{6}) by one immediately interested, is substituted the judgment of a cool and impartial tribunal. But in a primitive society the case is different: here what a manslayer has to fear is not *public* prosecution, but the *personal* vengeance of the relatives of the slain man (comp. in Arabia, W. R. Smith, *Kinship*, pp. 22 f., 53). Hebrew law is still in a relatively primitive stage; the *Go'el*, and not the State, executes justice on the murderer (v.^{12} 2 S. $14^{7.11}$; Nu. $35^{19\text{-}25}$): but his authority is *limited*; restrictions are placed in the way of his acting hastily or in passion (v.$^{4.6}$); according to Jos. $20^{4f.}$ (D^2) the manslayer is under the protection of the elders of the city of refuge; in Nu. $35^{24f.}$ (P) the case between him and the avenger of blood is subject to the decision of the "congregation"; and the murderer is to be put to death only on the evidence of more than one witness (Nu. 35^{30}: comp. the general rule in Dt. 19^{15}).—See further, in illustration of the custom of blood-revenge, A. H. Post, *Entwicklungsgeschichte des Familienrechts*, pp. 113–137.

14. **The landmark of a neighbour not to be removed.**—A species of encroachment which, to judge from allusions elsewhere, was not uncommon in ancient Israel: comp. 27^{17} Hos. 5^{10} Pr. 22^{28} (אל תסג גבול עולם אשר עשו אבותיך), 23^{10} (אל תסג גבול עולם ובשדי יתומים אל תבא), Job 24^{2} (named here, as in Dt. 27^{17}—see v.$^{18.19}$—by the side of other acts of aggression perpetrated upon the unprotected). Among other nations, also, as Knobel reminds us, boundaries were treated as inviolable: among the Greeks, for instance, they were under the protection of Ζεὺς ὅριος; Plato (*Legg.* viii. 842 E), probably repeating an older law, ordains μὴ κινείτω γῆς ὅρια μηδεὶς μήτε οἰκείου πολίτου γείτονος μήτε ὁμοτέρμονος, κ.τ.λ.; and the Romans even deemed it allowable

13. דם הנקי] 2 K. 24^{4} Jer. 22^{17}†: see Ew. § 287^{a}; G-K. § 128. 2 R^{3}.

Digitized by Google

to slay those who attempted to move them (Dion. Hal. ii. 74; Plutarch, *Numa* 16), and celebrated the annual festival of the *Terminalia* in honour of the god Terminus (Ovid, *Fasti*, ii. 639 ff.).—*Which they of old time have set*] lit. *the former ones* (ראשנים), *i.e.* ancestors (Lev. 26^{45}). Holdings of land, inherited by the poor occupier from his ancestors (comp. in Pr. 22^{28} "thy fathers"), are not to be encroached upon by a wealthier neighbour. The law, in its present wording, presupposes the occupation of Canaan by the Israelites, the ראשנים being evidently not the Canaanite predecessors of the Israelites, but the Israelitish ancestors of the present possessors.—*In the land, &c.*] the usual Deut. formula (1^{20} 12^{1}).

15–21. The law of witness. No person is to be judicially condemned on the testimony of a single witness; and a malicious witness is to be punished in accordance with the Lex talionis.—15. *At the mouth of two witnesses, &c.*] the same precautionary rule, which is laid down in 17^{6} and Nu. 35^{30} (P) in the case of capital charges, is here reaffirmed as a general principle in the administration of criminal law.—*Shall a matter be established*] or "a word be confirmed," *i.e.* (subjectively) be treated as valid (Nu. $30^{5.6.8}$).—**16–21.** When a malicious witness accuses a person wrongfully, the accuser and the accused are both to appear before the central tribunal (17^{9}); and the witness, if his dishonesty be clearly proved, is to be punished with the same penalty which his testimony, if true, would have brought upon the person whom he accused.—**16.** *A malicious witness*] lit. *a witness of violence* (עֵד חָמָס), *i.e.* a witness who either meditates some covert violence himself, or who assists by his false testimony the high-handed wrong-doer: so Ex. 23^{1} Ps. 35^{11}.—*To testify against* (5^{17}) *him of defection*] viz. from law and right. Elsewhere the term (סָרָה) is used of defection from God in a religious sense (on 13^{6}); but here it appears from the context to be used more generally, as perhaps also in Is. 59^{13}.—**17–19.** *Then both the men who have the dispute*, *i.e.* the witness suspected of dishonesty and the person whom he accuses, *shall stand before Jehovah* (12^{7}), *before the priests and the judges who shall be in those days*, *i.e.* shall

17. אשר להם הריב] 2 S. $15^{2.4}$.

Digitized by Google

appear at the central sanctuary, before the supreme tribunal there constituted (17^9, with the note); *and the judges*, sitting there, *shall inquire diligently* ($13^{15\,(14)}$ $17^{4.\,9}$) into the question in dispute; and if the result of the inquiry be to show that the witness has spoken untruthfully, *then shall ye do unto him as he had purposed* (Zech. 1^6 Jer. 51^{12}) *to do unto his brother*, viz. by accusing him falsely upon a criminal charge. The question is treated as belonging to the class of more difficult cases, reserved for the jurisdiction of the central tribunal (see on $17^{8\text{ff.}}$).—*So shalt thou exterminate the evil from thy midst*] the same concluding formula as in other similar cases (on $13^{6\,(5)}$). —**20.** *And those which remain shall hear, and fear, &c.*] similarly $13^{12\,(11)}$.—**21.** No compunction is to be felt in executing the sentence.—*Thine eye shall not pity*] v.^{13} 7^{16}.—*Life* (shall be given) *for life, eye for eye, &c.*] similarly Ex. 21^{24} (JE) Lev. $24^{18.\,20}$ (H); but each time for a different offence: in Ex. in the special case of men fighting together, and injuring in the struggle a woman with child; in Lev. quite generally, in the case of a man doing his neighbour some bodily harm. *Life* is lit. *soul*: see on 12^{23}.

XX. *Three Laws designed to secure Self-control and Forbearance in the Conduct of War.*

"These laws are peculiar to Dt.: their aim, however, is not to regulate the entire conduct of war, but only to check the barbarity and cruelty with which it was carried on by many ancient nations, especially by the Assyrians, to bring it, as far as possible, under the influence of the higher moral spirit of Israel's religion, and to secure recognition for the claims of humanity and moderation" (Dillmann, after Ewald, *Antiquities*, p. 314). The chap., where it stands, separates c. 19 from 21^{1-9} (both of which deal with cases connected with murder), while it is itself, on the other hand, cognate with 21^{10-14}. Perhaps its original place was after 21^9, where it would form a suitable introduction to 21^{10-14} &c.

1–9. The spirit of trustful confidence in presence of the foe,

18. והנה] = "and if" (13^{15}).—**21.** נפש בנפש] the ב is the ב *pretii* (14^{25}): Ex 21^{23} Lev. $24^{18.\,20}$ תחת "instead of" is used.

Digitized by Google

and of regard for the circumstances and interests of individual soldiers, in which a military expedition is to be undertaken by Israel.—1–4. The Israelite is to reflect, and to be reminded also by the priest accompanying the host, that Jehovah is ever beside them, as their champion and ally.—*And seest horses and chariots*] which were always formidable to the Israelites, and with which, in particular, the Egyptians and Assyrians were well provided.—*Who brought thee up, &c.*] and thereby gave evidence of His power to help thee: comp. 7^{17-19}, and for the ptcp. 8^{14-16}.—**2.** *That the priest shall approach, &c.*] the priest, viz. who is in attendance upon the host, for the purpose of performing the necessary sacred functions.

The presence of a priest (or priests) with the army, is not otherwise expressly attested, at least as a standing custom; but it may be inferred—though some of the instances are, it is true, not of a character to establish a rule—from such passages as 1 S. 4^{4} [omit "there" with 𝔊], ^{18} 14^{18} 2 S. 11^{11} (the *ark* taken into the field); 1 S. $7^{9f.}$ $13^{9f.}$ (sacrifices before an engagement); Nu. 10^{9} 31^{6} (both P) 2 Ch. $13^{12.14}$; and from the expression *to consecrate* (קִדֵּשׁ) *a war* (or *warriors*), which refers apparently to the sacrifices offered at the opening of a campaign (Mic. 3^{5} Jer. 6^{4} 22^{7} $51^{27.28}$ Is. 13^{3} Joel 4^{9}).

3. *Hear, O Israel*] 5^{1}.—*Let not your heart be soft*] or *tender* (יֵרַךְ): cf. v.^{8} Is. 7^{4} Jer. 51^{46}.—*Nor be alarmed* (ואל תחפזו)] cf. on 16^{3}.—*Neither be affrighted* (ואל תערצו) 1^{29}.—*Is he that goeth with you, to fight for you, &c.*] cf. 3^{22}.—**5–7.** Permission is further to be given by public proclamation through the host, for those who have engaged recently in certain important domestic undertakings, to return home, and enjoy the anticipated satisfaction or pleasure of which death in the field might otherwise deprive them. These provisions are a remarkable illustration of the sympathetic regard for the interests and feelings of others, which characterizes the author of Dt.—**5.** *The officers* (שטרים)] *i.e.* subordinate military officials (1^{15}); it may be presumed that these kept the register of those who served in the army; and hence it would naturally be their duty to know who had received authorized leave of absence.—*Who is the man that hath built a new house, and not dedicated it? let him go and return, &c.*] the dedication of the temple

XX. 1. המעלך] on 8^{14}.—**2.** קָאָרְבְכֶם] *qórobkhém*: G-K. § 61. 1 R.^{2}

Digitized by Google

(1 K. 8^{63}), of an altar (Nu. 7^{10}), and of an image (Dan. $3^{2.3}$), is alluded to elsewhere, but not the dedication of an ordinary private house.—6. *Not used the fruit thereof?* (חִלְּלוֹ)] lit. *not profaned it* (the vineyard), *treated it as common* (so 28^{30} Jer. 31^{5}). —the first produce of the vines being reserved as sacred, and not used by the owner: comp. Lev. 19^{23-25}.—7. *That hath betrothed a wife, &c.*] comp. 24^{5}, where exemption from military service is granted to those who are newly married, for the space of a year.—8. The faint-hearted are also to be allowed to return home, lest their presence should have a demoralizing effect upon the other soldiers.—*Soft-hearted*] (הָרַךְ הַלֵּבָב)] cf. 2 Ch. 13^{7}: above, on v.^{3}—*Melt*] 1^{28}.—9. Only when this proclamation has been made, and the numbers of those who intend to remain at their post are accurately known, is the army to be marshalled in divisions, under their respective commanders.—*That they shall appoint captains of hosts*] probably the captains of hundreds, and thousands, often mentioned elsewhere (p. 18): but the expression is an unusual one (cf. 1 K. 2^{5}, 1 Ch. 27^{3}). The subject of "shall appoint" will hardly be "the officers" (Keil), for the duty of appointing commanders is one that is likely to have been entrusted to a more responsible authority: more probably, the subject is indefinite, Engl. "they," Heb. הַפֹּקְדִים (see philol. note on 15^{2}), *i.e.* those whose business it was to appoint them (Dillm.).—For an example of this law being acted upon, see 1 Macc. 3^{56}.

10–18. In attacking a hostile city (provided it be not one belonging to the Canaanites), a formal offer of peace is always to be first made to it; and it is to be treated with severity only in case this offer be declined.—10. *Then proclaim peace to it*] *i.e.* invite it to surrender peaceably; cf. Jud. 21^{13}.—**11.** *Shall be for forced labour unto thee* (יִהְיוּ לְךָ לָמַס), *and shall serve thee*] "tributary" (RV.) expresses the general sense, but not the special ideas associated with the Heb. *mas*, which implies

8. ולא יִמַּס את לבב] constr. as 12^{22}. 𝕲 (ἵνα μὴ δειλιάνῃ) Sam., however, express יִמַּס (cf. 1^{28}), which may be right.—**10.** וקראת אליה לשלום] lit. "call to it *with reference to* peace"; cf. for the ל 1 S. 17^{18}.—**11.** אם שלום תענך] words like אם, כי, למען, פן, &c., are as a rule followed immediately by the verb: שלום is here prefixed for emphasis; cf. 2 S. 17^{13} 1 K. 20^{18} Ex. 21^{3}.—והיה . . . יהיו] on 12^{11}.

liability to *forced service*, or *task-work*, such as an Eastern monarch is wont to exact of his subjects (cf. Jos. 16^{10} 1 K. 9^{21} [the "forced labour of one doing service," cf. "and shall serve thee" here]; and on 2 S. 20^{24}).—**12–14.** But if the offer of peace be declined, then the siege is to be proceeded with; and if the city be captured, all the male population may be slain with the sword, the women and children, together with the cattle and spoil, being reserved as a prey for the captors. Such treatment of a conquered city, measured by a modern standard, may be deemed severe: but it must be recollected (1) that it is only *ex hypothesi* to be resorted to, after the offer of more favourable terms has been distinctly made and refused; and (2) that it is lenient as compared with the barbarities often practised in ancient warfare upon a conquered people; the law implies no sanction or excuse for such atrocities as are alluded to in Am. $1^{3.13}$ Hos. 14^{1} (13^{16}) 2 K. 8^{12}, or for the torture of prisoners, and other cruelties, perpetrated, as their own monuments declare, by the Assyrians (comp. Rawlinson, *Anc. Monarchies*,[4] i. 478 f.).—**14.** *But the women*, *&c.*] the women and children are to be spared (contrast v.[16] 2^{34} &c.), the case not being one for the application of the *ḥérem* (on 7^{2}).—*Take for a prey unto thyself* (תָּבֹז לָךְ)] 2^{35} 3^{7}.—*Eat*] *i.e.* enjoy, use for thine own sustenance and profit.—**15.** *Of these nations*] *i.e.* of the nations of Canaan.—**16–18.** But in the case of cities belonging to the Canaanites, no such forbearance is to be exercised: their inhabitants, in accordance with the provision 7^{2-4}, are to be all put to the sword, lest they should lead the Israelites into immorality and irreligion.—*Aught that breatheth*] lit. *any breath* (כָּל־נְשָׁמָה): the same expression Jos. 10^{40} $11^{11.14}$ (D^2) 1 K. 15^{29} (Deut.); Ps. 150^{6}†. From Jos. 11^{14} it seems that only human beings are denoted by it: this is in accordance with the predominant usage of נשמה, which is applied to the breath of life in man, Gn. 2^{7} 1 K. 17^{17} Is. 42^{5} 57^{16} Job 27^{3} 34^{14}, but is used only once of animals, Gn. 7^{22}.—**17.** *Utterly destroy*] lit. *devote*: see on 7^{2}.—*The Ḥittite*, *&c.*] on 7^{2}.—*Commanded thee*] 7^{2}: comp. Ex.

12–13. *And when*, *&c.*] so AV. RV., accommodating the sentence to Eng. idiom: cf. on 8^{12-17}, and Dr. § 149.—נְכוּרָה] 16^{16}.—**15.** אשר לא . . . הנה] 17^{15}.

Digitized by Google

$23^{31\text{-}33}$,—18. *That they teach you not to do after all their abominations . . ., and so ye sin, &c.*] cf. 7^4 12^{31} 18^{12}.

19–20. The fruit-trees belonging to the territory of a besieged city not to be wantonly destroyed by the besieger.— A common practice with invading armies, often, for example, mentioned in Greek warfare (*κείρειν* or *τέμνειν τὴν γῆν*, &c.). In 2 K. $3^{19.\,25}$ the Israelites invading Moab, at Elisha's instigation, "cut down every good tree." "In Arabic warfare the destruction of an enemy's palm-groves is a favourite exploit (*OTJC.*[2] p. 369); see for ancient times 4 Esdr. 15^{62}, Ibn Hishām, ed. Wüst. p. 13, l. 4, 'He was resolved . . . to root out the people of Medina, and cut down the palm-trees,' and for recent times Palgrave, *Travels in Arabia*, chap. v." (W. R. Smith, MS. note). It was also an Assyrian custom— at least *after* the capture of a city—to destroy the valuable trees in the vicinity, esp. the date-palms (Rawlinson, *Anc. Mon.*[3] i. 474, 475, with the illustration).—19. *For is the tree of the field man, that it should be besieged before thee* (lit. *enter into siege from before thee*)?] *i.e.* that it should be subjected, like the walls of a city, to the assaults of a besieger: Israel's hostility, namely, may be directed excusably against men, who are national adversaries, but not against trees capable of supplying it with sustenance. The rendering, which is that of all the ancient versions, and nearly all modern commentators, implies the alteration of a point (הֲאָדָם for הָאָדָם) in the Massoretic vocalization, which here yields no appropriate sense: see below. *Enter into siege*, as 2 K. 24^{10} 25^2: cf. Jer. 10^{17}; Ez. 4^3.—20. *Bulwarks*] rather *siege-works*, the same word (מָצוֹר) which is rendered "siege" in v.[19]: cf. Ez. 4^2 Mic. 4^{14} Is. 29^3.—*Until it fall*] lit. *come down* (28^{52} Is. 32^{19}).

18. למען . . . וחטאתם] as 7^{25}.—**19.** לנרח] G-K. § 114. 2 R.[4]—כי הָאָדָם וג׳] can only be rendered, "man is the tree of the field," which is explained to mean "man *consists of* the tree of the field," *i.e.* he lives on it (so Ibn 'Ezra who paraphrases כי חיי בן אדם הוא עץ השדה, whence AV.; Schultz, who compares 24^2 Ez. 12^{10} [corrupt] Eccl. 12^{13}). But though this idiom occurs in Heb. (Dr. § 189. 2), the present would be a very extreme instance of it, and the rend. leaves the clause לבא מפניך במצור unexplained. הֲאדם for הָאדם removes all difficulty.—**20.** עץ מאכל] Lev. 19^{23}.—אתו] resuming עץ: cf. Ps. 101^5, and on 13^1.—אשר הוא עֹשָׂה] as Gen. 9^3 Nu. $14^{8.\,27}$ (*Lex.* הוא **2 c**; Dr. § 199 *Obs.*).

Digitized by Google

XXI. 1–9. Symbolical ceremony for the expiation of an untraced murder.—If a man be found murdered in the open country, and there be no indication who the murderer is, the elders of the city which is nearest to the spot where the corpse was found, are to procure a heifer which has never been used for any work, to take it to a running stream, and having there slain it, in presence of the priests, to wash their hands over it, at the same time solemnly avowing before God that their city is guiltless of the murder, and entreating Him to forgive His people for the crime that has been committed in its midst. The law is peculiar to Dt., though the feeling which underlies it, viz. that the shedding of innocent blood defiles a land or people, until some recognized atonement be offered for it, is one which is often expressed elsewhere. The rite prescribed is of an archaic character, and is certainly much older than the law of Dt. in which it is here embodied.

In Arabia, when a man was found slain, the people of the place had to swear that they were not the murderers (Smith, *Kinship*, p. 263). "In the *Kitāb al-Aghānī*, ix. 178, l. 25 ff., the responsibility for a homicide is thrown on the nearest homestead (*dār*). This is part of the arrangement made by 'Amr b. Hind as arbiter between the two tribes to prevent the recrudescence of war between Bakr and Taghlib. Doubtless in the Hebrew law also the original object was to preclude blood-feud" (W. R. Smith, MS. note).

1. *If there be found*] 17^2 24^7.—*Is giving thee to possess it*] 19^{14}; cf. 15^4 25^{19}.—**2.** *Thy elders and thy judges*] *i.e.* those of the surrounding cities (cf. on 19^{12} 16^{18}).—**3–4.** The city which is nearest to the scene of the murder is to be held responsible for the due performance of the expiating rite, its "elders" acting naturally on its behalf (on 19^{12}).—**3.** *Which hath not been wrought with, &c.*] cf. 15^{19} Nu. 19^2.—**4.** *Unto a valley* (wādy) *with ever-running water*] see below.—*Which is neither plowed nor sown*] *i.e.* is an uncultivated spot.—*And shall break the heifer's neck there*] the heifer, in this rite, is manifestly designed

XXI. 1. לא נודע] a circ. cl. = "*it not being* known" (Dr. § 162).—**3.** היה העיר וג׳] construe as 12^{11} (where see note).—אשר לא עֻבַּד בה] "wherewith *it hath not been worked*"—an impers. passive, as v.[4] ("wherein *it is not tilled*"), Is. 14^3 "the hard labour אשר עֻבַּד בך wherewith (cogn. accus.) *it was worked* with thee"; cf. 16^{10} 53^5 Nµ. 16^{29} (on 2 S. 17^{16}).—**4.** נחל איתן] 𝔊 φάραγξ τραχεῖα, Aq. (see Field, *ad loc.*) χείμαῤῥος στερεός, Onq. נַחַל בַּיִּר (uncultivated), hence 𝔖 בּיּרא (do.), 𝔙 *asperam atque saxosam*, AV. *rough*. The

Digitized by Google

as a substitute for the unknown murderer, and bears the penalty which ought properly to be his. It is not regarded as a proper sin-offering, and accordingly it is not slaughtered with any special ritual (Lev. 4¹ff.), but merely put to death by having its neck broken (Ex. 13^{13} 34^{20} Is. 66^{3}): at the same time, the fact that the animal is to be a young one, which has not been used for any profane purpose, shows that a certain sanctity is conceived to attach to it, and, as Dillm. observes, that it possesses to some extent the character of a sin-offering (comp. Nu. 19^{2}). And it is to be slaughtered by an ever-flowing stream, in an uncultivated spot, in order doubtless that the blood may be carried away by the torrent, and that any which falls upon the earth may sink into it, without the risk of being uncovered at some future time when the soil is disturbed by the plough.—**5.** *The priests the sons of Levi*] 31^{9}: usually "the priests the Levites" (18^{1}). The priests here meant may possibly be those of the central sanctuary: but more probably, by an inexactness of language (p. 219), the members of the priestly tribe resident in the locality (18^{6}): cf. Baudissin, *Priesterthum*, 82, 84.—*For them, &c.*] cf. 10^{8} 18^{5}. —*And according to their sentence* (lit. *mouth*) *shall every dispute and every stroke be*] *i.e.* they are to have a voice in

word is one of those of which the true meaning was lost by the Jews; and it was accordingly represented both by the ancient versions and by the mediæval Jewish commentators, Rashi, Ibn 'Ezra, Qimchi, &c. (whence AV.) by conjectural renderings, more or less agreeable with the context, such as *strong*, *mighty*, *hard*, *rough* (comp. the AV. of Gen. 49^{24} Ex. 14^{27} Nu. 24^{21} Jer. 5^{15} Ps. 74^{15} Pr. 13^{15}). As soon, however, as Arabic began to be studied systematically, and compared with Hebrew, the real meaning of איתן at once revealed itself; Schultens, in his *Origines Hebrææ* (1724), i. 8, pointed out that the root must be the Arabic *watana*, *to be constant*, *unfailing*, esp. of water; hence נחל איתן Am. 5^{24} a *perennial*, or *ever-flowing* torrent (wādy), here of a torrent-valley (see on 2^{13}), the stream in which flowed continuously. In Ex. 14^{27} Ps. 74^{15} איתן is construed as a subst. = "continuous flow": elsewhere it is used fig. to denote *permanent*, *enduring*, *sure*, as Gen. 49^{24} of a bow, Nu. 24^{21} (a dwelling), Jer. 5^{15} (a nation, whose numbers never dwindle or fail), Job 12^{19} (of men firmly seated, or established, in a position of dignity), &c. The opposite of אֵיתָן is אַכְזָב Jer. 15^{18}. In form, the word is an "elative," *i.e.* it has an intensive force, the corresponding formation in Arabic denoting the comparative or superlative degrees of an adjective; in Hebrew it fell out of use, except in a few instances, as אַשְׁמָן, אַכְזָר, אֵיתָן, אַכְזָב (Ew. § 162^{b}; Stade, §§ 255, 256^{b}).

Digitized by Google

every legal decision of importance (cf. 17^{8-10}). Here the presence of the priests appears to be required, not for the purpose of taking part personally in the ceremony (which is performed throughout by the "elders" of the city concerned), but rather for the purpose of imparting to it a religious character, and of securing that the prescribed rites are properly performed.—**6.** *And all the elders of that city . . . shall wash their hands over the heifer, &c.*] thereby expressing symbolically that the city which they represent is innocent of the crime (Mt. 27^{24}: cf. Ps. 26^{6} 73^{13}), and transferring the guilt of it to the animal representing the murderer.—**7.** *Answer* (ענו)] in a liturgical sense ($27^{14.15}$).—*Neither have our eyes seen it*] *i.e.* nor have we any knowledge who is the murderer.—**8.** *Clear* (כַּפֵּר) *thy people*] the root-idea of *kappēr* is either (from the Arab.) *to cover* (see Wellh. *Comp.* 335 f.), or (from the Syr.) *to wipe off* (see *OTJC.*[1] 438 f., (more briefly) [2] 381; cf. מָחָה *blot out* Is. 43^{25} 44^{22}),—in either case, the general sense being that of *obliterating* or *cancelling* sin, or (in the rare cases where the obj. is a person) *clearing* the sinner. In the OT. generally the subj. is God, as 32^{43} Jer. 18^{23} Ez. 16^{63} (with ל, as here), Ps. 65^{4} 78^{38} 79^{9}; cf. the pass. v.^{8b} 1 S. 3^{14} Is. 6^{7} 22^{14} Pr. 16^{6}: in P the subj. is mostly the priest, the verb being used absolutely in the sense of *perform an obliterating* (*atoning*) *rite*. See further pp. 425–6; and on Lev. 1^{4}.—*Which thou hast ransomed* (7^{8})] the appeal is grounded on the gracious relation subsisting between Jehovah and His people, which was sealed by their deliverance from Egypt.—*Set not innocent blood in the midst of thy people*] let it not remain, infecting and incriminating thy people (cf. with נתן על *to lay upon*, Jer. 26^{15}

7. לא שפכה] the Kt. is שָׁפְכָה, the fem. sing. with the plural (or dual) ידינו understood (as in Arab.) *collectively*, as 1 S. 4^{15} Ps. 18^{35} 37^{31} *al.* (Ew. § 317^{a}; G-K. § 145^{d}). The Qrê (שָׁפְכוּ) substitutes the more ordinary construction, as it does in Jer. 2^{15} 22^{6} Ps. 73^{2b}. The correction is, however, unnecessary; for the cases in which the verb is in the impf. (as Ps. 37^{31}) are sufficiently numerous to show that the construction is genuinely Hebrew. (Aram. and Eth. have a 3 pl. *fem.* in *ā*: hence Peters, *Hebraica*, 1887, p. 111, 1889, p. 190 f., supposes these forms to be isolated examples of the same form in Heb.; see, however, Nöld. *ZDMG.* 1884, p. 411.).—**8.** נִכַּפֵּר] a *Nithpa'el* form, with double reflexive prefix, very common in post-bibl. Hebrew (Strack u. Siegfried, *Lehrb. der Neuhebr. Sprache*, § 91^{a}, *e.g.*

Digitized by Google

Jon. 1[14]). The community, as a whole, is responsible for the crime committed in its midst, until the murderer has been brought to justice (Nu. 35[33]), or, if this is impossible, until some expiation has been offered, and accepted, for his offence. —**9.** *And thou* (emph.) *shalt exterminate the innocent blood from thy midst*] thus shall Israel perform the duty of clearing itself from the stain of murder (comp. 19[13]).—*When thou shalt do that which is right* (6[18]) *in the eyes of Jehovah*] in obeying Jehovah's behest, Israel will clear itself of the guilt resting upon it.

XXI. 10–XXV. *Miscellaneous Laws, relating chiefly to Civil and Domestic Life.*

The section beginning here is marked by several peculiarities of terminology, which are to be accounted for, probably, by the fact that the laws contained in it (which are often more concisely worded than in the previous chapters) are taken more directly, and with less modification of form than in other cases, from older sources.

10–14. On marriage with a female captive taken in war. —An Israelite is at liberty to bring home with him a female captive, but he may not formally treat her as his wife until he has allowed her a month in which to mourn for her lost parents. He may afterwards, if he ceases to care for her, permit her to leave him, but he must not sell her into slavery. The law (which is peculiar to Dt.) inculcates thoughtfulness and forbearance under circumstances in which the Israelitish warrior, elated by victory, might readily deem himself at liberty to act as he pleased. It is connected by its subject-matter with c. 20; and perhaps (as remarked on 21[1]) was once immediately preceded by c. 20. The case contemplated is manifestly that of warfare with foreign nations, after Israel is settled in Palestine (v.[10] "when thou *goest forth*," &c.), not with the nations of Canaan, with whom no intermarriages are to be contracted (7[3]).—**10.** *When thou goest forth to battle*

נִזְּסַר (נִתְאַבְּלוּ, נִתְקַיְּמוּ), though the only other example in the OT. is Ez. 23[48] (G-K. § 55[9]; Stade, § 169[b]). The constr. with לְ, as Is. 22[14] (Pu'al).—**10.** אויביך] perh. "originally אוֹיִבְךָ, in agreement with נתנו and שביו: so 28[48]"

against thine enemies] exactly as 20¹.—*And Jehovah thy God delivereth him into thy hand*] as 20¹³; cf. on 3².—**11.** *Hast a desire unto her* (וחשקת בה)] 7⁷ 10¹⁵; as here, Gn. 34⁸.—**12.** *She shall shave her head, and pare her nails*] a symbolical expression of the fact that her forsaken condition is at an end, that she has found a husband who will care for her, and that she is about to begin life again under new auspices, in close relationship with the people of God.

In ancient Arabia, a widow passed the year after her husband's death in seclusion, without washing or otherwise attending to her person: and she would terminate her period of mourning by some formal act, such as *paring her nails*, or plucking out the hair from her face (Lane, *Arab. Lex.* p. 2409ᵇ; Wellh. *Arab. Heid.* 156; Smith, *Kinship*, 178; *OTJC.*² 368). The present injunction is based probably on such a custom, though, as the woman is not represented as being actually a widow, she may lay aside the marks and (v.¹³) the garb of her forlorn state, as soon as her prospects of a husband and of a home are assured.

"Pare" is lit. *make* (עשה), i.e. *shape aright, dress*: cf. of the beard, 2 S. 19²⁵.—**13.** *The raiment of her captivity*] her captive's garb (Is. 3²⁴).—*And shall remain in thine house* (Gn. 38¹¹), *and bewail her father and her mother for a month of days*] cf. the month's mourning of Nu. 20²⁹ Dt. 34⁸ (for Aaron and Moses). The object of the provision is evidently (Keil, Dillm.) to give her time to become reconciled to her separation from her parents (Ps. 45¹¹⁽¹⁰⁾), and her own people, and to accustom herself to her new surroundings, into which she has been brought against her will.—**14.** *Let her go whither she will*] lit. *according to her soul* (or *desire*: 24¹⁵); see Jer. 34¹⁶.—*Thou shalt not sell her for money*] the restriction is in virtual agreement with the provision laid down in Ex. 21⁸ (JE) for the case

(Di.); cf. however on 7¹⁰.—ושבית שביו] cf. Nu. 21¹ Jud. 5¹² Ps. 68¹⁹.—**11.** שביה] 32⁴² 2 Ch. 28⁵.—אשת יפת תאר] for the *st. c.* אשת, cf. 1 S. 28⁷ Ps. 58⁹ (before a rel. clause), and the common phrase . . . בתולת בת. אשת, not less than יפת, is determined by תאר (cf. 1 S. 16¹⁸); but the gen. which determines it is deferred, or held in suspense, by the introduction of the parallel יפת. Comp. Ew. § 289ᶜ; G-K. § 130⁵.—**13.** והסירה . . . מעליה] cf. Gn. 38¹⁴·¹⁹ 1 S. 17³⁹.—ירח ימים] so 2 K. 15¹³†; חדש ימים Gn. 29¹⁴ Nu. 11²⁰·²¹†. ימים is prob. not a genit., but in appos. with ירח: cf. שנתים ימים (Dr. § 192. 1; G-K. § 131. 2 *c*). —**14.** לא תתעמר בה] cf. 24⁷ והתעמר בו ומכרו†. The meaning is uncertain. Arab. *ghamura* is *to be copious* or *abundant*, of water, *ghamara* is *to rise above* (of water), *to submerge*, fig. *to surpass, excel* (in stature, dignity, &c.); conj. iii. *ghāmara* to *plunge into a fight, attack in conflict, ghamrah* is a *sub-*

Digitized by Google

of a man, who has taken his female bond-servant to wife, and desires afterwards to part with her.—*Thou shalt not play the master over her*] on תתעמר (24^{7}†), see below.—*Because thou hast humbled her* (עִנִּיתָהּ)] עִנָּה of dishonouring a woman, as 22$^{24.29}$ Gn. 34^{2} 2 S. 13^{12} *al.* (cf. below).

15–17. The rights of the firstborn.—The firstborn son is not to be disinherited, or deprived of his legitimate share of his father's property, in the interests of the son of a favourite wife: he is to receive a share twice as large as any of his brothers. Peculiar to Dt. The law is designed to guard against the case which, it is evident, might readily arise, of a man's abusing his paternal prerogative through the influence of a favourite wife.—**15.** *If a man have two wives, the one beloved and the other hated*] as happened, for example, in the case of Jacob (Gn. 29$^{30.31}$: cf. 1 S. 1^{5}).—**16.** *In the day that he causeth, &c.*] a certain testamentary power was thus possessed by the ancient Israelite (cf. Gn. 24^{36} 25^{5}; 2 S. 17^{23} 2 K. 20^{1}); but it was limited by custom and law (cf. Nowack, *Archäol.* § 64).—**17.** *But he shall acknowledge* (יַכִּיר) *the firstborn*] properly, *recognise him* (Gn. 42^{8}), viz. as being what he is, and possessing rights above his brethren.—*By giving him a share of two in all that he hath*] lit. "*a mouth of two*" (פִּי שְׁנַיִם). The same idiomatic expression recurs 2 K. 2^{9} ("let a share of two in thy spirit fall to me," *i.e.* a share twice as large as any of thy other disciples; may I rank as the firstborn among them), Zech. 13^{8}.—*The beginning of his strength*] the first-fruits of his virile powers: so Gn. 49^{3} (of Reuben), cf. Ps. 78^{51} 105^{36}.—*The right of the firstborn is his*]

merging flood. In so far as the meaning in Heb. may be at all inferred from these data, the reflex. conj. would have some such fig. sense as *deal despotically, play the master* (cf. 𝔊 24^{7} *καταδυναστεύσας*): Ges. *irruit in aliquem, manum ei admovit violentius.* RV. paraphrases.—תחת אשר] 22^{29} 28$^{47.62}$ *al.*; cf. תחת כי 4^{37}.—עניתה] Arab. *'anā* (*'anāw*) is *to be submissive, obedient* (Qor. 20^{110}), esp. by becoming a captive, iv. *to make* or *treat as a captive* (see esp. Rahlfs, עני *und* ענו *in den Psalmen*, 1892, p. 67 ff.). ענה in Heb. means analogously to *treat as a subject* or *dependent*, with the acquired idea of *treating irresponsibly, to maltreat, to humble*, by depriving of independence, or liberty, or recognized rights: cf. Gn. 16^{6} (∥ "to do what is right in one's own eyes: so Jud. 19^{24}), Gn. 31^{50} Jud. 16$^{5.6.19}$, ∥ *to serve* or *to enslave* Gn. 15^{13} Ex. 1$^{11.12}$ (cf. v.^{13}); of a woman, specially to *treat with disregard of her womanly rights*, to *dishonour.*—**16.** לא יוכל] 7^{22}.—על פני] *in front of = in preference to*: cf. Ex. 20^{3}.

Digitized by Google

the position and privileges of the firstborn were highly valued (cf. Gen. $25^{31.34}$ 27^{36}). The present law does not institute the right of the firstborn, but invests with its sanction an established usage, and guards it against arbitrary curtailment.

18–21. The incorrigible son.—A son who persistently refuses to obey his parents, is to be arraigned by them publicly before the elders of his city, and stoned to death. This particular law is peculiar to Dt.; but respect towards parents is inculcated in the Decalogue: death is prescribed in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 21^{15}) as the penalty for smiting, as also, both in the same Code (*ib.* v.[17]) and in H (Lev. 20^{9}), for cursing, father or mother: in Dt. 27^{16} he that "setteth light by his father or his mother" is pronounced accursed.—*Stubborn and rebellious* (סוֹרֵר וּמוֹרֶה)] Jer. 5^{23} Ps. 78^{8}.—*Chasten* (יִסְּרוּ)] 8^{5} Pr. 19^{18} 29^{17}: here, probably, including bodily correction (22^{18}: cf. on 4^{36}; and see Pr. 13^{24} 22^{15} $23^{13f.}$ 29^{15}).—**19.** *And shall bring him forth*] 17^{5} $22^{21.24}$.—*Unto the elders of the city*] whose duty it was to take cognizance of offences against social and family right: see on 19^{12}.—*And unto the gate of his place*] in which the elders sat, and where the law was administered: comp. 22^{15} 25^{7} Ruth $4^{1-2.11}$. The "gate"—more properly the *gateway*, with a depth corresponding to the thickness of the wall in which it was constructed, having a gate at the inner and outer ends (hence "between the two gates," 2 S. 18^{24}), and doubtless seats along each side—is thus the Oriental forum; and it is often alluded to as the place in which the administration of justice was carried on, *e.g.* Am. $5^{10.12.15}$ Is. 29^{21} Job 31^{21} Ps. 127^{5}. Cf. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, i. (S. Palest.) 27 ff.—**20.** *The elders of his city*] Sam. 𝔊 "the men of his city" (as v.[21]), which, however, appears here to be less suitable than "elders."—(Being) *a glutton and a drunkard*] the same combination (זוֹלֵל וְסֹבֵא) Pr. 23^{21} (cf. v.[20] "be not among those that drink wine, that *squander* flesh upon themselves"); זולל (properly a *squanderer*) also Pr. 28^{7}. The words are manifestly intended to hint at the ground of the young man's obstinacy, though from the nature of the case they will not be meant except as an example of what

20. בננו זה] on 5^{26}.

Digitized by Google

might be said on such an occasion.—**21.** *All the men of his city, &c.*] comp. $13^{11\,(10)}$ 17^{5} 22^{24}. "*All,*" because it is to the common interest for all to take part in putting down the wrong: cf. $13^{10\,(9)}$. Nothing is said of any investigation on the part of the elders into the truth of the parents' allegation: no doubt this is passed over, as an understood thing, in the case of a criminal charge.—*So thou shalt exterminate, &c.*] $13^{6\,(5)}$.—*Shall hear and fear*] $13^{12\,(11)}$ 17^{18} 19^{20}.

As shown above, Hebrew law insisted on respect being paid to parents, and Hebrew moralists did not hesitate to commend the rod as a salutary instrument of education; but the father's authority—though, at least in an earlier age (Ex. 21^{7}), he could sell his daughter into slavery—was not despotic: he had not, as at Rome, power of life and death over his son; where (as in the case here contemplated) vice and insubordination became intolerable, he could not take the law into his own hands, he must appeal to the decision of an impartial tribunal (cf. Nowack, *Archäol.* § 28, *end*). The present law will hardly, however, have been often carried into practice: "in Pr. 30^{17} disobedience to parents is cited as a thing which brings a man to a bad end, not as a thing punished by law" (*Rel. Sem.* p. 60).

22–23. The body of a malefactor, exposed, after execution, upon a tree, to be taken down and buried before nightfall.—*If there be in* (15^{9}) *a man a sin, a judgment of death* (19^{6})] *i.e.* a proved capital charge.—*And he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree*] the malefactor was hung, not, as with us, for the purpose of being executed, but *after* execution, as an additional disgrace (comp. Jos. 10^{26} 2 S. 4^{12}): it was exposure before God and man, a public proof that the adequate penalty had been paid by him for his offence.—**23.** *His body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt bury him on the same day*] cf. Jos. 8^{29} 10^{27} (where the bodies of the kings defeated by Joshua are removed "at the going down of the sun").—*For he that is hanged is accursed of God, and thou shalt not defile thy land, &c.*] probably the exposure of a malefactor's corpse by hanging was resorted to only in the case of heinous offences: it could be taken therefore as significant of the curse of God (Gn. 4^{11} Dt. 27^{24}) resting

22. חטא משפט מות] a case of apposition, מ׳ מ׳ limiting and defining the sense of חטא: cf. Ex. 24^{5} זבחים שלמים, Is. 3^{24} מַעֲשֶׂה מִקְשָׁה, &c. (Dr. § 188. 1).—**23.** כי קללת אלהים תלוי] "a curse of God"=accursed of God (Dr. § 189. 2). So 𝔊 (*κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*), Aq. Theod. (*κατάρα θεοῦ* [see Field]), 𝔙 (maledictus a Deo), and virtually all moderns. There was, however, a current

Digitized by Google

specially upon the offender; and as murder, like other abominable crimes, was held to render the land in which it was perpetrated unclean (Nu. $35^{33f.}$; Lev. $18^{24f.\ 27f.}$), so the unburied corpse, suspended aloft, with the crime as it were clinging to it, and God's curse resting visibly upon it, had a similar effect. Hence, as soon as the requisite publicity has been attained, the spectacle is to end: the corpse, at sunset, is to be taken down, and committed to the earth, as a token that justice has completed its work, and that the land has been cleansed from the defilement infecting it (comp., in the case of murder, Nu. 35^{33b} c. 19^{13} 21^{9}).—*Accursed of God*] see below.

XXII. 1–4. On neighbourly feeling and regard.—The lost property of a neighbour, if found, is to be restored to him, or kept until he claims it, v.[1-3]. Assistance is to be cheerfully rendered to a neighbour in difficulty, v.[4].

[1] Thou shalt not see thy brother's ox or his sheep driven away, and hide thyself from them: *thou shalt surely bring* them *back to* thy brother. [2] And if thy brother be not nigh unto thee, &c. [3] And so shalt thou do with *his ass*, and so shalt thou do with his garment, &c.	Ex. 23^{4} If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him.
[4] *Thou shalt* not *see* thy brother's *ass*, or his ox, fallen down in the way, and hide thyself from them; thou shalt surely lift (them) up *with him*.	[5] If thou shalt see the ass of him that hateth thee couching down under his burden, thou shalt forbear to leave it to him (alone); thou shalt surely loosen it with him.

The law is evidently an expansion of that in Ex. $23^{4f.}$ (JE), with modifications, accommodating it to the spirit and point of view of Dt. The "enemy" in Ex. is noticeable: it is

Jewish interpretation, which treated אלהים as the obj. gen. (Gn. 27^{13}), "a curse—*i.e.* reproach, insult—*to* God": so *ap.* Ariston of Pella [2nd cent.], quoted by Jerome, λοιδορία θεοῦ ὁ κρεμάμενος; Ps.-Jon. "For it is contempt (קילותא) before God to hang a man, except his sins have caused it; and because he is made in the image of God, thou shalt bury him," &c.; Rashi "It is a slight to the King (ולוולו של מלך), because man is made in the image of God." The same constr. also underlies the (ungrammatical) paraphrases of Onq. "for because he hath sinned before God he is hung," Symm. "propter blasphemiam Dei suspensus est," 𝔖 "for he that blasphemeth (מן רמצחא) God is hung," *Siphré* [ancient Heb. Comm. on Dt.] מפני שֶׁקִּלֵּל את השם. Comp. Lightfoot, *Galatians*,[3] p. 150 (on Gal. 3^{13}).

XXII. 1. לא תראה . . . והתעלמתָ] on 7^{23}.

an old-world anticipation of the spirit of Mt. 5^{44}. In Dt. "brother" is substituted, not for the purpose of excluding one who may be an enemy, but in order to make the application of the precept as wide as possible (cf. on 15^{2}). For "driven away"(נִדָּחִים), *i.e.* parted forcibly from the herd through some mishap, cf. Mic. 4^{6} Zeph. 3^{19} (with קבץ "gather"), Ez. $34^{4.16}$ (with "bring back").—*Hide thyself*] Is. 58^{7} Ps. 55^{2}.—**2–3.** Additions (except the "ass" in v.^{3}) to the law of Ex.: (1) if the owner be not at hand, or unknown, his lost animal is to be kept till he comes to claim it: (2) all other lost property that may be found is to be dealt with similarly.—**2.** *Until thy brother require it*] or *demand it*, viz. as something that he has a claim to: cf. $23^{22(21)}$ Ez. 33^{6} $34^{6.8.10.11}$. דָּרַשׁ expresses more than "seek after" (RV.), which would correspond to בִּקֵּשׁ (1 S. 9^{3}).—**4.** The uncommon, and probably archaic, uses of עָזַב in Ex. 23^{5b} are replaced here by more ordinary phrases.

5. The sexes not to interchange garments, or other articles of attire.—Peculiar to Dt. No doubt the prohibition is not intended as a mere rule of conventional propriety,—though, even as such, it would be an important safeguard against obvious moral dangers,—but is directed against the simulated changes of sex which occurred in Canaanite and Syrian heathenism, to the grave moral deterioration of those who adopted them (cf. *OTJC.*^{2} 365).

According to Macrob. *Sat.* iii. 8, and Servius on *Aen.* ii. 632, there was in Cyprus a statue of a bearded Venus, *barbatum corpore sed veste muliebri, cum sceptro ac natura virili*, who was considered to be of both sexes (cf. Ellis on Catull. 68^{51}), and to whom sacrifice was offered by men dressed as women, and women dressed as men: and noisy processions of Galli, or eunuch-priests of Cybele, the mother of the gods, paraded the towns and villages of Syria, Asia Minor, and other parts, attired as women, and soliciting the populace to unholy rites (Apul. *Metamorph.* viii. c. 24 ff.; August. *Civ. Dei*, vii. 26; cf. Luc. *de dea Syria*, §§ 15, 26, 51 (at Hierapolis); Jerome on Hos. 4^{14}; and Movers, *Die Phönizier*, i. 678 ff.). At Aphaka, in Cœle-Syria, Constantine put down a temple of Aphrodite, the priests of which are described by Eusebius as γύνιδές τινες ἄνδρες οὐκ ἄνδρες, τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς φύσεως ἀπαρνησάμενοι (*Vit. Const.* iii. 55), on account of the character of the rites carried on at it.

A woman shall not wear an article pertaining to a man (כלי

2. ואכפתו] cf. 2 S. 11^{27} 17^{13} Jud. $19^{15.18}$ (אִסֵּף).—עד . . . והשבתו] cf. 1 S. 1^{22} 2 S. 10^{5} (Dr. § 115, *s.v.* עד).—**3.** אֲבֵדָה] Ex. 22^{8} Lev. $5^{22.23}$†.—לא תוכל] 7^{22}.

Digitized by Google

(נבר)] כלי is a very general term, applicable to almost any article used or worn, *e.g.* weapons (Gn. 27^{3}), jewels (24^{53}), ornaments (also household objects, implements, vessels, &c.), Lev. 13^{40} (a "thing" of skin), 1 S. 17^{40} (a shepherd's "bag"): it is thus a much wider term than "garment"; and hence the indefinite rendering of AV. "that which pertaineth unto."—*For whosoever doeth these things is an abomination unto Jehovah*] so 18^{12} 25^{16}; cf. on 7^{25}.

6–7. A man finding a bird's nest may take the young birds or the eggs, but is not to take the mother with them.—Peculiar to Dt. The law is generally considered to rest upon a humanitarian motive (cf. 25^{4}), and to direct regard to be paid to the parental relation in animals (cf. Lev. $22^{27f.}$); but Fenton (*Early Heb. Life*, p. 48) thinks it "rests upon the idea that one may have 'right of user' in the bird to the extent of sharing in its produce; but one may not claim entire possession of it."—**7.** *That it may be well for thee, &c.*] 4^{40}. The promise is the same as that which is attached in 5^{16} to the command to pay honour to human parents.

8. Human life not to be endangered by neglect. Every house-top is to be provided with a parapet, as a protection to those using it for recreation or other purposes.—This law also is peculiar to Dt.; but a provision prompted by the same general motive is found in Ex. $21^{33f.}$ (a pit not to be left open, so that an ox or an ass may fall into it).—*A parapet*] as is well known, the top of an Eastern house is flat, and capable of being used for recreation and many other purposes (Jos. 2^{6} Jud. 16^{27} 1 S. $9^{25f.}$ 2 S. 11^{2} 16^{22} Is. 22^{1} Jer. 19^{13} Zeph. 1^{5} Mt. 24^{17} Acts 10^{9}).

9–11. Prohibition of non-natural combinations.—A vineyard is not to be sown with different kinds of seed; a field is not to be plowed with an ox and an ass working together; and no garment is to be worn, made of wool and linen in com-

6. יקרא . . . לפני] "happens before thee," *i.e.* chances accidentally to be before thee: 2 S. 18^{9} cf. 20^{1}; Gn. 24^{12} 27^{20} (הִקְרָה).—האם על הבנים] על idiom. = *together with*: cf. Gn. 32^{12} Hos. 10^{14} Job 38^{32} (*Lex.* על 4 c).—**8.** מעקה] only here: prop. a *confining* enclosure (𝔊 στεφάνη); Arab. *'aqā* to *hinder, withhold.*—תשים דמים בביתך] cf. נתן דמים ב׳ 21^{8}, שם דמים על Jud. 9^{24}, נתן דמים על Jer. 26^{15} Jon. 1^{14}.—כי יפל הנופל] on 17^{6}.

Digitized by Google

bination. The motive of the prohibition appears to be the preservation of natural distinctions: species—at least as they now exist, and are known to us—are designed by God to be distinct (comp. Gn. $1^{11.12.21.24.25}$); each possesses its own characteristic features; and a principle thus visibly impressed by the Creator upon nature is not to be interfered with by man. The second provision is peculiar to Dt.; the first and third are found, without very material variation, in Lev. 19^{19} (H), where they are preceded by a provision, to which nothing corresponds in Dt., against permitting cattle of different species to breed together.

[9] *Thou shalt not sow thy* vineyard *with two kinds* (of seed); lest the full produce (המלאה) be forfeited (תקדש), the seed which thou sowest, and the increase of the vineyard. [10] Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together. [11] Thou shalt not wear *mixed stuff* (שעטנז), wool and linen together.

Lev. 19^{19} Thy cattle thou shalt not make to gender in two kinds: thy field thou shalt not sow with two kinds (of seed): and a garment of two kinds, of mixed stuff (שַׁעַטְנֵז), shall not come up upon thee.

9. Why "vineyard" takes here the place of "field" in Lev. is not apparent: as it is the subject of the entire law, it can hardly be meant as an example of the kind of "field" contemplated; $23^{25f.}$ $24^{19.21}$ the two are also distinguished. If it may be assumed that Lev. presents an earlier form of the law than Dt., it is possible that in the interval it had become the custom to plant fields generally with different kinds of seed (cf. Is. 28^{25}); the legislator, consequently, may have tacitly conceded the custom in such cases, and have satisfied himself with retaining the prohibition in the case of vineyards alone. Others think the law of Lev. a later extension of that of Dt. The explanatory clause, v.^{9b}, stating the consequence if the prohibition be disregarded, is peculiar to Dt. "Be forfeited" is lit. *become holy* or *sacred* (תִּקְדַּשׁ), *i.e.* be forfeited to the sanctuary, a synonym of היה קדש, Lev. $27^{10.21}$ Jos. 6^{19}; comp. the same verb in Lev. $6^{11(18)}$ Nu. $17^{2f.}$ ($16^{37f.}$). The last words, "the seed which thou sowest," &c., define more distinctly what is intended by הַמְּלֵאָה (Ex. $22^{28(29)}$ Nu. 18^{27}),

Digitized by Google

viz. not only the grain, vegetables, &c., sown (in infringement of the prohibition) between the vines, but also the produce of the vines themselves.—**10.** Ploughs are still in Palestine sometimes harnessed to an ox and an ass (Conder, *Tent Work*, 328).—**11.** The form of the sentence differs, but the substance is similar in Lev. and Dt. The peculiar, and evidently "foreign word," שַׁעַטְנֵז, is common to both laws: in both also the term is explained; but in Dt. it is said, more definitely than in Lev., to denote a combination of wool and linen. Only the particular material thus styled is forbidden. The minuter definitions of the later Jews, on the subject of these laws, will be found in the Mishnic treatise *Kil'aim*.

12. Tassels to be worn by the Israelites, as a distinctive badge, upon the four corners of their mantles.—The law corresponds to the one in Nu. 15^{37-41} (P, perhaps in particular H), where the object of the tassels is also explained (v.[39f.]), viz. to remind the Israelites of their obligations to Jehovah, and to check them when they are tempted to pursue too keenly personal interests or ambitions.—*Twisted cords* (גְּדִלִים) *thou shalt make thee upon the four corners of thy covering* (Ex. $22^{27\,(26)}$), *wherewith thou coverest thyself*] Nu. 15^{38} "Say unto them, And they shall make them tassels (צִיצִת) upon the corners of their garments (בגדיהם) throughout their generations, and they shall put upon the tassel of each corner a cord of blue" (for the purpose, namely, of fastening it to the garment). Nu. uses צִיצִת, which appears to have been the more technical term; Dt. has גְּדִלִים *twisted threads* or *cords*, which is found (in a different connexion) 1 K. 7^{17} ("wreaths" of metal work).

The rend. "fringe" is inaccurate. The *ẓiẓith* was a cord, ending in a *tassel*,—the cord, according to the usage of the later Jews, consisting of eight threads of white wool, twisted round each other a prescribed number of times, and tied, at intervals, in five double knots (see Kitto's *Bibl. Cyclop.*, *s.v.* FRINGES, with the illustrations). The ordinary outer garment worn by the Hebrews (שִׂמְלָה or בֶּגֶד—more rarely, as here, כְּסוּת) was a large quadrangular piece of stuff, probably like the modern *'abâye*, of coarsely woven wool, which was thrown round the body something in the manner

11. שעטנז] Lev. 19^{19}†. Of uncertain origin; but not improbably Egyptian, 𝔊 κίβδηλος; whence Kn. explains "woven falsely," from Copt. *saht*, *woven*, and *nudj*, *false* (Peyron, *Lex.* pp. 224, 133).—**12.** גדלים] in Syr. Arab. the root גדל is preserved with the meaning *to twist* or *plait* (*e.g.* Mt. 27^{29} 𝔖).

Digitized by Google

of a Scotch plaid (cf. Benzinger, *Archäol.* p. 98 f.); and these "tassels" were attached to its four corners. In a later age, when the Jews were exiled from Palestine, as the tassels on the outside attracted notice, and led to persecution, they were transferred to the inner garment; and ultimately the custom arose of attaching them also to the *Ṭallith*, or quadrangular mantle, worn at the time of morning prayer (Kitto, *l.c.*).

XXII. 13–XXIII. 1 (XXII. 30). *Laws relating to Marriage* (*see also* 24^{1-4} 25^{5-9}).

XXII. 13–21. Procedure to be adopted in the case of a newly-married wife being alleged by her husband not to have been a virgin.—(1) If the allegation be false, the girl's parents are to appear with the proofs of their daughter's virginity before the elders of the city, who are then to punish the husband with stripes, and to impose upon him a fine of 100 shekels of silver; he is moreover to take back his wife, and to be deprived for ever of the right of divorcing her, v.$^{13-19}$. (2) If the allegation be true, and proof of the girl's virginity be not forthcoming, she is to be brought out to the entrance of her father's house, and there stoned to death by the men of her city, v.$^{20-21}$.—**13.** *Hate her*] *i.e.* turn against her, after his carnal desires have been satisfied (comp. 2 S. 13^{15}).—**14.** *Frame against her wanton charges*] lit. *caprices of words*, *i.e.* baseless allegations, wantonly made for the purpose of obtaining a divorce from her. The rend. "shameful things" (RV.) is a free one, and has no claim to philological exactness.—*And utter* (והוציא) *an evil name against her*] or *publish* (v.^{19}; cf.

14. עלילות דברים] a difficult and uncertain expression. עלילה is elsewhere "action"; but it is only found in poetry (Ps. 9^{12} 14^{1} &c.); and "acts of words" (Schultz, Kn. Ke.) is a weak and doubtful expression for "acts giving rise to unfavourable comments or reports." Perh. Dillm. is right in having recourse to the sense of the root עלל, which is certainly preserved in התעלל "to work one's will on," and in תעלול "wilfulness, caprice" (cf. Fleischer's note in Del. on Is. 3^{4} [ed. 3]), and in rendering "caprices of words," *i.e.* wanton and arbitrary charges. Of the versions, 𝕲 renders by ἐπιθῇ αὐτῇ προφασιστικοὺς λόγους, connecting עלילות with the Aram. עלא (cf. Arab. *'illah*) "occasion, cause, pretext"; similarly 𝔙 ("quæsieritque occasiones quibus dimittat eam"), 𝔖 ("and draw after her a pretext with words"), probably Onq. וישוי לה תסקופי מילין, *i.e.* either "impute to her occasions of words" (*i.e.* of unfavourable remarks), or "bring against her pretexts of words," *i.e.* fictitious charges (comp. in Levy not only תסקופא, but also סקף Ithpe., and תוסקפא), Ps.-Jon. ערר דמילין "an objection of words," *i.e.* an adverse charge, Ibn 'Ezra "עלילות *occasions*," AV. "give occasions

Digitized by Google

Pr. 10^{18} Nu. 13^{32} $14^{36.37}$).—**15.** *Shall bring forth the tokens of the damsel's virginity*] the procedure of a primitive-minded people. The criterion is not an infallible one, it being quite possible that the absence of the tokens referred to may result from other causes than the one to which it is here supposed to point. Nevertheless, among many Eastern peoples, the old feeling still survives, and much importance continues to be attached to them, as evidence of the bride's chastity: among the Arabs of Egypt, and the Moors, for instance, immediately after the consummation of a marriage, they are displayed ostentatiously to the relations of the newly-married couple, and sometimes even more publicly: * similar customs prevail among the village populations of Syria and Palestine: † and their absence, unless it could be satisfactorily explained, would be regarded as justifying the bridegroom in dissolving the marriage, and compelling the father to take back his daughter,

of speech against her." The meaning "occasion, pretext," however, though belonging to Aram. עלא, Arab. *'illah*, and to עלילה in post-Bibl. Heb. (Levy, *NHWB.* iii. p. 654), is not otherwise that of the Biblical עלילה (or of the root עלל generally). Aq. ἐναλλακτικὰ ῥήματα, in accordance with his peculiar style of translation (he rendered עלילה elsewhere by ἐναλλαγή, תעלולים by ἐναλλάγματα, &c.: see Ps. 9^{12} 102^{7} Is. 3^{4} 66^{4} in the Hexapla, with Field's note on Jer. 38^{19}: and on the style of Aquila, Field's *Hexapla*, i. p. xxi ff.).—שׂם ל־] with the rend. adopted above, שׂם will mean *make* (14^{1}), *frame*; but, if עלילת signifies *acts*, it will have the force of *attach*, *impute to* (cf. שׂם בּ lit. *to lay in* 1 S. 22^{15} Job 4^{18}), and לה must be inserted in v.[17] with Sam. 𝔊. ואקרב אליה] Gn. 20^{4} Lev. $18^{6.14}$ 20^{16} Is. 8^{3}.—מצא ל־] "to find *belonging to*": so v.[17.20] 1 S. 13^{22} Hos. 12^{9}.—**15.** הנער] Kt. הַנַּעַר, Qrê הַנַּעֲרָה. In the Pent. the *fem.* נערה is found only Dt. 22^{19}, the masc. form נער being otherwise used for both genders (for the fem. 21 times, viz. Gn. $24^{14.16.28.55.57}$ $34^{3.3.12}$ Dt. $22^{15.15.16.20.21.23.24.25.26.26.27.28.29}$): the Massorites, however, directed in these cases the usual form נערה to be substituted in reading, hence the Qrê הנערה. At what time the epicene נער went out of use, we do not know; it may not have been until after the Pent. was so far canonized that its text was deemed unalterable, and while in the rest of the OT. the Kethib was accommodated, where necessary, to the more modern usage, in the Pent. the change was made only in the Qrê.

* Leo Afric. (ed. 1632) p. 325 (Pory's transl. 1600, p. 143 f.); Tournefort, *Voyage in the Levant*, 1718, ii. 69; Arvieux, *Voyages à Constantinople, &c.*, 1735, iii. 306; Höst, *Marokos*, 1781, p. 103; Niebuhr, *Descr. d'Arabie*, 1776, i. 35 ff.; Burckhardt, *Arab. Proverbs*, 1830, p. 117, *Bedouins*, 1831, i. 266;—quoted by Knob. Cf. (for Africa) Post, *Afrik. Jurisprudenz*, i. § 146.

† Wetzstein in Bastian's *Z. für Ethnol.* 1873, p. 290 f.; Klein in the *Z. des Deutschen Pal.-Vereins*, 1883, p. 100.

Digitized by Google

and refund the *mahr* (v.[23]).—**17.** *Shameful things* (RV.)] see on v.[14].—*Spread* (Jud. 8^{25}) *the garment*] the *salmah* was used for sleeping in (24^{13}): but perhaps the word may be meant here in a more general sense (21^{13} $22^{3.5}$).—**18.** *Chastise him* (ויסרו אתו)] viz. with corporal punishment (cf. on 21^{18}): according to Jos. *Antiq.* iv. 8. 23, he received the legal "forty stripes save one" (25^{3}).—**19.** *Shall fine him an hundred* (shekels of) *silver, and give them, &c.*] "fine" (עָנַשׁ) as Ex. 21^{22} Am. 2^{8}: cf. the subst. 2 K. 23^{33} (RV. *marg.*). The fine is a compensation to the father for the malicious defamation of his daughter: its amount is twice that payable by the seducer of an unbetrothed virgin, v.[29].—*And she shall be his* (emph.) *wife, &c.*] in spite of his effort to be rid of her, she shall remain *his* wife; he shall never be at liberty to divorce her.—**20–21.** The case of the allegation being true.—**21.** *Bring out*] 17^{5}.—*To the entrance of her father's house*] she is to pay the penalty of her sin openly, in front of the house which she has disgraced.—*The men of her city shall stone her, &c.*] cf. 21^{21}.—*Hath wrought senselessness* (נְבָלָה) *in Israel*] the same reproachful phrase Gn. 34^{7} Jos. 7^{15} Jud. $20^{6.10}$ Jer. 29^{23}, and without *in Israel*, Jud. $19^{23.24}$ 2 S. 13^{12} (cf. v.[13] the corresponding adj.) Job 42^{8}†,—always of acts of immorality except Jos. 7^{15} (an act of irreligion) and Job 42^{8} (see Dillm.[2]).

Nābāl and *nebālāh* are very difficult to render in English. "Fool," and "folly" (besides being needed for the more common כסיל, אויל, כסילות, אולת) are inadequate, and suggest wrong associations. The fault of the *nābāl* is not weakness of reason, but moral and religious insensibility, a rooted incapacity to discern moral and religious relations, leading to an intolerant repudiation in practice of the claims which they impose. The ideas associated with the *nābāl* appear most clearly in Is. 32^{6}; he is painted there as at once irreligious and churlish (cf. "Nabal," 1 S. 25^{25}). The term is thus applied to Israel, unappreciative of Jehovah's benefits (c. 32^{6}), to the heathen (32^{21} Ps. $74^{18.22}$), to the man who cannot perceive that there is a God (Ps. $14^{1}=53^{1}$); see also 2 S. 3^{33} 13^{13} Is. 32^{5} Jer. 17^{11} Ez. 13^{3} Ps. $39^{9(8)}$ Pr. $17^{7.21b}$ 30^{22} Job 2^{10}†. *Nebālāh*, besides the passages quoted, occurs only 1 S. 25^{25} Is. $9^{16(17)}$ (‖ *profanity*) 32^{6}†. The cognate *nablūth* occurs Hos. $2^{12(10)}$† in the sense of *immodesty*. *Senseless* and *senselessness* may be suggested as fair English equivalents, it being understood that the defective "sense" which they predicate shows itself particularly in acts of impiety, profligacy, and churlishness, and that it is, in fact, the latter ideas which the two words, in actual use, really connote.

---

20. אמת] cf. 13^{15}.—לא נמצאו ἀσυνδέτως, as 13^{15} 17^{4}.—**21.** ונסתה] so v.[24] וָמֵתוּ: see G-K. § 104. 2°.—לזנות] Sam. 𝔊 לְהַזְנוֹת.

So shalt thou exterminate, &c.] $13^{6\,(5)}$. So v.[22. 24].

22. Adultery.—If a man be found committing adultery with a married woman, both alike are to be put to death. Adultery is forbidden, not only in the Decalogue, but also in Lev. 18^{20} (H): the penalty provided for it here is in agreement with the law of Lev. 20^{10} (also H). The manner of execution is not expressly prescribed either here or in Lev.; but it was understood (on the analogy of v.[24]) to be by stoning; comp. Ez. $16^{38.\,40}$ $23^{45.\,47}$ John 8^{5}. Cf. Post, *Familienrecht*, p. 358 f.

23–29. Seduction.—Two cases are distinguished: (1) that of the girl being already betrothed to a husband, v.[23-27]; (2) that of the girl being unbetrothed, v.[28-29]. The first case is treated as virtually one of adultery, the girl, after betrothal, being regarded as pledged to her future husband, as fully as if she were formally married to him; she is described accordingly (v.[24]) as his "wife," and the penalty (except in the case, v.[25], where the girl can be reasonably acquitted of blame) is the same as for adultery, viz. death for both parties. For this case there is no parallel in the other Codes of the Pent. (1) The seduction of a girl already betrothed to a husband, v.[23-27]. Here the penalty prescribed differs, according as the girl may, or may not, be reasonably deemed to have been a consenting party: in the former case (v.[23-24]) both parties are to be punished with death, in the latter (v.[25-27]), the man only. —**23.** *Betrothed to a man*] betrothal is, in Eastern countries, an important preliminary to marriage, and a more solemn and formal proceeding than our "engagement." Among the Arabs it is a legal act, whereby, upon consideration of a price paid (*mahr*, Heb. *mōhar*: cf. on v.[29]), a girl is handed over by her father or guardian to the suitor, and the marriage, as a legal procedure, is thereby terminated.* It is hence apparent why the seduction of a betrothed virgin is treated practically as a case of adultery. For other allusions to betrothal in the

22. בְּעֻלַת בעל] Gn. 20^{3}†.—גם שניהם] 23^{19}: *Lex.* גַּם 2 *end.*

* Wellh. *Die Ehe bei den Arabern*, in the Göttingen *Nachrichten*, 1893, No. 11, p. 480 f.; Smith, *Kinship*, p. 78 f.; Benzinger, *Hebr. Arch.* p. 138 f.; Klein, *ZDPal.-Vereins*, 1883, p. 89 f.: cf. Edersheim, *L. & T.* i. 354. A very widely diffused custom (Post, *Familienrecht*, p. 157 ff., 173 ff.).

Digitized by Google

OT., see v.[25. 27. 28] 20[7] 28[30] Ex. 22[15 (16)] 2 S. 3[14] Hos. 2[21f. (19f.)].—**24.** *Unto the gate, &c.*] the place of execution, as 17[5].—*Humbled* (עִנָּה)] see on 21[14].—**25.** *And the man take hold of her*] "force her" (AV., RV.) is too strong a rendering: הֶחֱזִיק בְּ is simply *to take hold of*, 25[11] Gn. 19[16] and often; for the same purpose as here, 2 S. 13[11].—**26.** *Riseth up against*] 19[11]. (2) The seduction of a girl who is not betrothed, v.[28-29]. In this case, the seducer is to be compelled to take the girl as his wife, and to forfeit the right to divorce her during the rest of his life. In JE Ex. 22[15f. (16f.)] corresponds, though the provisions are not quite the same; the seducer is to pay similarly a price to the father for the girl to become his wife, but the amount is left undefined; and it is open to the father to refuse to give her to him; in Ex. also the seducer is described as using *persuasion* (יְפַתֶּה), while here the case contemplated seems to be one in which *force* is employed.—**28.** *Lay hold on her* (וּתְפָשָׂהּ)] not the word used in v.[25], though a synonym of it (Gn. 39[12] 1 K. 13[4]).—*She shall be his wife; he may not put her away all his days*] as v.[19b].—*Humbled her*] v.[24].—**29.** *Shall give unto the damsel's father fifty shekels of silver*] the seducer is to be compelled to take the girl as his wife, and to pay (cf. Post, 350 f.) the price which by ancient custom (v.[23]) the suitor had to pay to the father (or family) of the bride. The technical term for this payment was *mōhar* (AV., RV. inexactly "dowry"), Gn. 34[12] Ex. 22[16 (17)] (the cognate verb in v.[15 (16)]), 1 S. 18[25] (cf. Smith, *Kinship*, p. 78 f.), corresponding to the Homeric ἕδνα (or ἐέδνα), *Il.* 16[178], *Od.* 21[160-162], &c. The amount of the payment would vary naturally with the position and circumstances of the bridegroom, as well as with the attractions of the bride; 50 shekels is probably named as an average: an ordinary price for a slave was 30 shekels, Ex. 21[32].

30 (XXIII. 1). Prohibition of marriage with a stepmother.—The same prohibition (differently worded) appears in Lev.

24. על דְּבַר אשר] 23[5] 2 S. 13[22]†: on דְּבַר, see G-K. § 130. 3.—**25.** ואם בשדה] on the position of בשדה, see on 20[11].——**26.** חטא מות] cf. 21[22].—כאשר יקום ... ורצחו] Am. 5[19] Is. 29[8] (Dr. § 115, *s.v.* כאשר).—ורצחו נפש] on 19[6].—**28.** אֹרָשָׂה] in pause, for אֹרָשָׂה (on 7[5]).—**29.** תחת אשר ענה] 21[14].

Digitized by Google

18^8 (H), "The nakedness of thy father's wife thou shalt not uncover; it is thy father's nakedness," and 20^{11}, where death for both parties is prescribed as the penalty for disobedience. —*Uncover his father's skirt*] so 27^{20}: cf. "to spread the skirt (1 S. $24^{6\,(5)}$ *al.*) over" a woman, Ez. 16^8 Ruth 3^9, fig. for to take her as a wife. Here the expression is evidently a euphemism.

In ancient Arabia a man's wives passed, like his other property, to his heir: a son could thus claim his father's wives (except, of course, his own mother) as part of his inheritance; and the practice of marriage with a stepmother is forbidden for the future in the Qor'ān (4^{26}). Examples (of an exceptional kind) in the OT. illustrating the same custom are Gn. 35^{22} 49^4; 2 S. 3^7; 16^{22}; 1 K. 2^{22}: but in Jerusalem such unions were still common in the time of Ezekiel (22^{10}), who condemns them (in words borrowed from Lev. 18^8); and in Syria they appear to have been not unusual in the 5th cent. A.D. (Smith, *Kinship*, pp. 86–90; *OTJC.*[2] 369 f.: see also Wellh. *l.c.* [p. 257 *note*], p. 461).

In Lev. $18^{6ff.}$ $20^{11ff.}$ the forbidden degrees of affinity are so numerous as to constitute a long list; hence it has been questioned why only one is mentioned in Dt. (see two others in the imprecations $27^{22.\,23}$). By some it has been thought that Dt. refers to the prohibition in Lev. 18^8 as representative of the whole series; but had this been the Writer's intention, he would surely have expressed it by means of some generally worded reference to the entire list. Others consider that Dt. exhibits the earlier stage in the law of forbidden degrees, which was afterwards developed through Ez. ($22^{10f.}$) to the comprehensive list of Lev. 18. It is hardly likely however that this was the only prohibited degree recognised in the age of Dt.: most probably (whether Lev. 18 be earlier than Dt. or later) marriage with a stepmother, being prevalent at the time, needed to be specially forbidden.

XXIII. 2–9 (1–8). Classes to be excluded from religious communion with Israel.—2 (1). Eunuchs not to be admitted into the theocratic community. "Presumably the original sense of this rule was directed not against the unfortunate victims of Oriental tyranny, and the Harem system, but against the religious mutilation of the Galli, as Lucian (*de dea Syria*, § 51) describes it at Hierapolis, and as Bardesanes (*Spicil. Syr.* p. 20, l. 1) attests it for Edessa (Cureton mistranslates). The Tar'atha of Bardesanes is, of course, Atargatis, the Syrian goddess" (W.R.S.). As court-officials, eunuchs are often depicted on the Assyrian monuments, being there at once recognizable by their bloated, beardless face, and double chin

XXIII. 1. לא יגלה כנף אביו] "a parallel expression occurs in Arabic, De Goeje, *Fragm. Hist. Arab.* 248, l. 3 *mā kashaftu li'mra'ati kanafa*ⁿ" (W.R.S.).

Digitized by Google

(*DB.*^{2} *s.v.*; Rawlinson, *Anc. Mon.*^{4} i. 496–498; in Persia, *ib.* iii. 221–223; in Egypt (Gn. 37^{36} Heb.), Ebers, *Aeg. u. die Bb. Mose's*, 298). As the kingdoms of Israel and Judah adopted the organization of the neighbouring monarchies, eunuchs assumed in them an increased rank and prominence (1 S. 8^{15} 1 K. 22^{9} 2 K. 8^{6} 9^{32} 23^{11} 24$^{12.15}$ 25^{19} Jer. 29^{2} 34^{19} 38^{7} 41^{16}). The allusion in this verse is to the two surgical operations by which the condition of a eunuch was most commonly produced; in modern times, the second is often resorted to in the East (Tournefort, *The Levant*, 1718, ii. 7; Burckhardt, *Nubia*, 1819, p. 330 (Knob.): cf. von Kremer, *Aegypten*, ii. 87–89).—*Enter into*] Gn. 49^{6}.—*Jehovah's assembly*] v.$^{3.4}$ [hence La. 1^{10} Neh. 13^{1}]^{9} $^{(2.3.8)}$ Nu. 16^{3} (P) 20^{4} (P) Mic. 2^{5} 1 Ch. 28^{8}†. The ground of the exclusion of eunuchs (in so far as it is not a protest against mutilation in the service of a heathen deity) is in all probability analogous to that referred to in 14^{1}: the deliberate mutilation of the nature which God has given to man is inconsistent with the character of Jehovah's people (comp. similar prohibitions in H, in regard to priests Lev. 21^{20}, and animals offered in sacrifice 22^{24}). Nevertheless, in the more spiritual conception of the kingdom of God, formed by the prophets, this, like other disqualifying carnal ordinances, has no place; and by the prophet of the exile (Is. 56$^{4f.}$) the eunuch, who in other respects is a loyal servant of Jehovah, is promised an honourable position in the ideal community of the future (cf. Acts 8$^{27.38}$).—**3 (2).** A bastard, even to the tenth generation, is not to enjoy communion with Jehovah's people.—*Bastard* (מַמְזֵר)] Zech. 9^{6}†. Of uncertain etymology: probably Rabbinical tradition (*Jebamoth* iv. 13: see Ges. *Thes.* 781; Levy, *NHWB.* iii. 140) is right in supposing the term to denote not generally one born out of wedlock (𝔊 ἐκ πόρνης, 𝔙 *de scorto natus*), but the offspring of an incestuous union, or of a marriage contracted within the prohibited degrees of affinity (Lev. 18$^{6-20}$ 20$^{10-21}$): the stain of their birth is to cling to such as these, including even their descendants to the tenth generation, and to pre-

2. פצוע דכה] lit. "wounded *of* (=*through*) crushing" (Ges. Dillm.), viz. of the *testes*.—**3.** לא יבא לו] for the ל of reference, cf. v.$^{4-9}$ Lam. 1^{10}; also Gn. 17^{10} 34^{15} 1 K. 2^{4} 8^{25} 14^{10} 1 S. 11^{2} (*Lex.* ל **5 a**).

Digitized by Google

clude them from participating in the full privileges of membership in the people of God.—**4–7** (**3–6**). The ʿAmmonite and the Moabite are to be placed on the same footing as the bastard, on account of their ancestors' unfriendly treatment of Israel at the time of the Exodus.—*Because they met you not with bread* (Is. 21^{14}) *and with water*] nothing is said in Dt. $2^{19ff.}$ respecting the conduct of the ʿAmmonites towards Israel: in 2^{29} the Moabites, it is implied, sold the Israelites bread and water for money (see the note there).—*In the way, when ye came forth out of Egypt*] so 24^{9} 25^{17}: here, at any rate, where the reference is to a date at the *close* of the 40 years' wanderings (cf. 2^{14}), the expression "when ye came forth out of Egypt" could not have been used by a contemporary, writing but six months afterwards, but betrays the writer of a later age, in which the 40 years had dwindled to a point.—**5** (**4**). *And because he hired against thee Balaʿam, son of Beʿor*] "he" is the king of Moab (Nu. $22^{5f.}$ &c.): the ʿAmmonites are not mentioned in connexion with Balaʿam.—*From Pethor of Aram-Naharaim*] in Nu. 22^{5} "Pethor, which is by the River" (*i.e.* the Euphrates), presumably identical with the Pitru of the Inscriptions, on the *Western* bank of the Euphrates (*KAT.*[2] 155 f.). Aram-Naharaim ("Aram of the two rivers" = Mesopotamia), as Gn. 24^{10} Jud. 3^{8} Ps. 60 *title*†.—**6** (**5**). This intention of the Moabites was, however, frustrated through Jehovah's love of Israel. The Writer avails himself of the opportunity of thus insisting on a truth upon which he lays great stress (7^{8} &c.).—*Turned the curse into a blessing*] Nu. $23^{11.25f.}$ 24^{10}.—**7** (**6**). *Thou shalt not seek their peace or their prosperity, all thy days for ever*] for the expressions, comp. Jer. 29^{7} Ezr. 9^{12} (a reminiscence from the present passage); also Jer. 38^{4}: *all thy days*, as 12^{19}, cf. $22^{19.29}$. Israel is not indeed permitted to hate the ʿAmmonite or the Moabite; but it is to remain permanently indifferent to their welfare. As the history abundantly shows, hostile relations were very apt to manifest themselves between the Israelites and their neighbours on the opposite side of the Dead Sea; and by the prophets both nations are depicted in an unfavourable light, Moab being charged with assuming

5. קִדְּמוּ בְּ'] Is. 21^{14}: also Mi. 6^{6} ψ. 95^{2}.—**6.** ולא אבה וג'] Jos. 24^{10}: cf. on 1^{26}.

Digitized by Google

towards Judah a haughty, independent attitude (Is. 16^{6} Jer. $48^{26.29.42}$ Zeph. 2^{8}), and the ʿAmmonites with waging cruel aggressive wars (Am. 1^{13}), and with exulting maliciously over Judah's misfortune (Zeph. 2^{8} Ez. $21^{33(28)}$ $25^{3.6}$). V.$^{4-6(3-5)}$ are quoted (in an abridged form) in Neh. 13^{1-2}; and Neh. 13^{3} describes how the principle embodied in them was immediately acted upon.—**8–9 (7–8).** The Edomite and the Egyptian, however, may be admitted in the third generation, the former because he is Israel's "brother," the latter because Israel was once a sojourner in his land.—**8 (7).** *Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite, for he is thy brother*] the feelings of rivalry and hostility, prevalent generally between Israel and Edom (comp. Gn. 25^{23} 27^{40} Nu. 20^{18-21} 2 S. 8^{13} (RV. *m.*) ^{14} 1 K. $11^{15f.}$ Am. 1^{11} Jer. 49^{7-22} Ez. 35 Is. 34, &c.), are to be overruled by the recollection of the ties of consanguinity which bound the two nations together (cf. on 2^{4}).—*Thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian, because thou wast a stranger in his land* (10^{19})] the case with Egypt is similar. In spite of the Egyptians' oppression of Israel, in spite, too, of the distrust and suspicion with which the prophets viewed the political interference of the Pharaohs with the affairs of Palestine (comp. on 17^{16}), the Israelites had once been *sojourners* in their land; and the recollection of this fact should soften their attitude towards them.—**9 (8).** *Children that are born to them of the third generation*] *i.e.* the descendants, in the third generation, of an Edomite, or Egyptian, settled in Canaan, may share the full privileges of the native Israelite (of course upon condition that they consented to be circumcised, and made a general profession of Israel's faith). It is probable that under the monarchy there was a good deal of intercourse between Egypt and Palestine: Israelites are mentioned more than once as visiting Egypt, the writers of the same period show considerable acquaintance with the peculiarities of the Egyptian climate or soil (Is. 19; Am. 9^{5} Nah. $3^{8f.}$ Jer. 46^{7}); and no doubt Egyptians frequently visited Palestine in a similar way.

7. לא תדרש שלומם] Jer. 29^{7} 38^{4} (לְ) Ezr. 9^{12} (+ וטובתם, as here).—**9.** It is better, syntactically, to place the athnaḥ at לָהם,—"As for the children who shall be born to them, the third generation may enter," &c.

10–15 (9–14). On the purity and cleanliness of the camp.—When Israel is engaged in a military expedition, the camp is not to be defiled by the presence within it of any accidental pollution, v.[11-12 (10-11)]; and a place is to be reserved outside the camp for the necessities of nature, v.[13-15 (12-14)]. P has a law analogous to the first of these provisions in Nu. $5^{1\cdot 4}$, where it is prescribed that everyone, of either sex, who is a lèper, or has an issue (see Lev. $15^{2.\ 19.\ 25}$), or is unclean through contact with a corpse (Nu. 19^{11} 31^{19}), is to be excluded from the camp: but the two laws are not identical; for while the prohibition in Nu. is much more comprehensive than that in Dt., the particular case which is alone contemplated in Dt. is not included in Nu. at all.—**10 (9).** *When thou goest forth*] 20^1 21^{10}.—*Thou shall keep thee* (2^4) *from every evil thing*] *i.e.* (here) from whatever is conventionally unbecoming: cf. 17^1 (phil. n.).—**11 (10).** *That is not clean by reason of an accident of the night*] see Lev. 15^{16}.—**12 (11).** *He shall bathe himself with water; and when the sun goeth down* (16^6 24^{13} Jos. 8^{29}) *he shall come within the camp*] the purification enjoined agrees with that prescribed in Lev. 15^{16} under the same circumstances, "he shall bathe all his flesh with water, and be unclean until the even."—**14 (13).** *A paddle* (יָתֵד)] the word commonly denotes a *tent-pin* or *-peg* (Jud. $4^{21.\ 22}$ 5^{26} *al.*), sometimes a *peg* or *nail* (Is. 22^{23}): here it must signify an implement of similar form, suitable for digging in the ground.—**15 (14).** The reason of the foregoing prohibitions, viz. lest Jehovah, who accompanies Israel in its wars ($20^{1\cdot 4}$), be obliged to withdraw Himself from the camp (cf. Nu. 5^{3b}).—*Walketh* (מתהלך)] the *hithp.* conjug. is stronger

10. כי תצא מחנה] "when thou goest forth *as* a camp": cf. 2 K. 5^2 "And Aram יצאו גדודים came forth *as* marauding bands," &c., מחנה, גדודים, being accusatives defining *how* the going forth took place (Ew. § 279^d; G-K. § 118. 5 *c*).—**11.** קְרֵה] *st. c.* of קָרֶה.—**12.** לפנות ערב] Gn. 24^{63}†: cf. לפנות (ה)בקר Ex. 14^{27} Jud. 19^{26} Ps. 46^6†.—**13.** יד] i.e. *side*, *place*: cf. Nu. 2^{17} Jer. 6^3; and on 2^{37}.—**14.** אזנך] only here. זַיְנָא, Syr. *zaino*, is a common Aram. word, meaning *weapon* (= Heb. כלי): זינא in 𝔗 (in בית זינין *quiver*, lit. *receptacle of weapons*, Is. 49^2 *al.*) means the same; and the Heb. אָזֵן, prob. a technical term, appears to be the same word. The word is construed collectively; but many MSS. have the plural אֲזֵנֶיךָ. 𝔊 (ἐπὶ τῆς ζώνης σου), 𝔙 express על אֲזֹרְךָ. In על אזנך, על has the sense of *in addition to*, *together with* (Gn. 28^9 31^{50} Nu. 31^8 *al.*: *Lex.* על 4 b): cf. on 22^6.—צאתך] AV., following the Rabb.

Digitized by Google

than the *qal* (1^{30} 20^{4}), and implies *going to and fro*, *going about* (see *e.g.* Gn. 3^{8} 13^{17} 2 S. $7^{6.7}$), *i.e.* accompanying the camp wherever it went.—*That he may see in thee no nakedness of a thing* (עֶרְוַת דָּבָר)] *i.e.* no indecency. The expression is peculiar, but recurs 24^{1}: "nakedness" is the word commonly used to denote the *pudenda* (Gn. 9^{22} and often), also used fig. of the nakedness of a land (Gn. $42^{9.12}$).—*Turn back from following thee* (ושב מאחריך)] Ruth 1^{16} 1 K. 19^{21} and often; of Jehovah, Jer. 32^{40}. Lit. *from after thee.*

16–17 (15–16). Humanity to be shown to a fugitive slave.—A slave fleeing from hard treatment in a foreign land, and taking refuge in Israel, is not to be delivered up to his master, but allowed to dwell in the land, wherever he may please.—**16 (15).** *Unto thee*] *i.e.* to Israel.—**17 (16).** *Within one of thy gates*] *i.e.* in one of thy cities (15^{7} 16^{5} 17^{2} 18^{6}; see on 12^{12}), implying that hitherto he had been in a foreign land.—*Thou shalt not oppress him* (לֹא תוֹנֶנּוּ)] Ex. 22^{20} Lev. 19^{33} (of the *Gêr*); not elsewhere in Dt.

18–19 (17–18). Against religious prostitution.—No Israelite, of either sex, is to become a temple-prostitute; nor is the gain derived from any kind of prostitution to be offered in payment of a vow.—*Temple-prostitute*] the allusion is to the immoral and repulsive custom, common in Canaanitish and Phœnician cults, by which persons of both sexes prostituted themselves in the service of a deity. The law in v.$^{18 (17)}$ is peculiar to Dt.; but Lev. 18^{22} (cf. 20^{13}), though general in its wording, is aimed probably at the same practice.

The renderings "harlot" and "sodomite" are both inadequate: in neither case is ordinary immorality intended, but immorality practised in the worship of a deity, and in the immediate precincts of a temple: see

---

deriv. from יצא, "that which cometh of thee"; and the same convenient euphemism is retained in RV.: but comparative philology shows that the word has really no connexion with יצא (= Aram. יעא: cf. Dr. § 178), but that it is cognate with the Syr. צאא (Pa.) *foedavit*, צאאותא, צאתא, *sordes*, *ῥύπος*, and means *filth* (cf. צוֹאָה Is. 4^{4} *al.*).—מחניך] *sing.* (G-K. § 93. 3. 3).—**16.** כסף] $15^{12.13.18}$ Ex. 22^{11} Lev. 25^{41}.—**17.** בַּטּוֹב לוֹ] Gn. 20^{15} בַּטּוֹב בְּעֵינֶיךָ שֵׁב, Jer. $40^{4b.5}$.—**18.** כלב] the term כלבים occurs in a (partly mutilated) enumeration of the ministers and other attendants attached to a temple of 'Ashtōreth at Larnaca in Cyprus (*CIS.* I. i. 86 B[10]), whence it has been supposed that it was the recognized Phœnician designation of the *ḳedēshīm* (*ib.* p. 95; *OTJC.*[2] 365 n.).

Digitized by Google

Hdt. i. 199 (in Babylon); Ep. of Jeremy 43 (also in Babylon); Strabo, xii. 36; Ramsay, *Cities of Phrygia*, i. 94 f., 115; Lucian, *Lucius*, § 38; Athan. *c. Gentes*, p. 24 E; Ges. *Thes. s.v.*; and cf. on 22^{5}. *Ḳādēsh* and *Ḳedēshāh* are, respectively, the masc. and fem. of the same adj. (lit. *sacred*), which denotes a person dedicated to a deity for the purposes indicated (𝔊 τελεσφόρος and τελισκόμενος, i.e. *initiates*). The *ḳedēshīm* (masc.) and *ḳedēshōth* (fem.) are frequently alluded to in the OT., especially in the period of the monarchy, when rites of foreign origin made their way into both Israel and Judah: see, for the former, 1 K. 14^{24} 15^{12} (banished from Judah by Asa) $22^{47\,(46)}$ 2 K. 23^{7} Job 36^{14}†; for the latter, Gn. $38^{21.\,22}$ Hos. 4^{14}†: comp. Jer. $3^{2.\,6.\,8f.\,13}$. Aq. ἐνδιηλλαγμένοι, *i.e. changed* (of sex); cf. on 22^{5}.

19 (18). *Hire* (אתנן)] the word used regularly of the payment made to a harlot (*e.g.* Mic. 1^{7} Is. $23^{17.\,18}$ Ez. 16^{34}); the expression thus includes the gains made by an ordinary harlot, as well as those of the *ḳedēshōth* mentioned in the previous verse.—*Nor the price of a dog*] *i.e.* (as the context shows) the price or payment (Mic. 3^{11}) which a "dog" receives, "dog" (כלב) being an opprobrious designation of the male *ḳedēshim* referred to in v.$^{18\,(19)}$: comp. κύνες Apoc. 22^{15}, and the note below. In the impure worships of antiquity, it was not uncommon for the gains of prostitution to be dedicated to a deity (cf. Hdt. i. 199; Lucian, *de dea Syria*, § 6, *Dial. Meretr.* 7, 1; 14, 3; Clem. Al. *Protrep.* p. 13).—*The house of Jehovah thy God*] only here in Dt.: cf. Ex. $23^{19}=34^{26}$ (JE), Jos. 6^{24} Jud. 19^{18}. Very often in Kings, &c., as a designation of the Temple.—*Both of them*] *i.e.* both the hire of a whore, and the price of a "dog," not both the givers and their gifts: see, on the force of גם, 22^{22} (phil. note).—*An abomination, &c.*] 18^{12}.

20–21 (19–20). On usury (interest).—The Israelite is not to lend to his brother-Israelite upon usury (interest); he may lend upon these terms to a foreigner, but not to his brother, if he desires Jehovah's blessing to rest upon his undertakings. V.$^{20\,(19)}$ is parallel with Ex. $22^{24\,(25)}$ in JE, and Lev. 25^{36-37} in H, in both of which passages a brotherly treatment of the impoverished Israelite is inculcated, and it is forbidden to take interest from him for a loan; the permission to receive interest from a foreigner (though implicit in the terms of Ex. and Lev.) is granted explicitly only in Dt.; and the promise of Jehovah's blessing is, of course, characteristically Deuteronomic (on 2^{7}). Virtually all loans in ancient

Digitized by Google

Israel were, it is probable (p. 178, and below), those directed to the relief of distress; and these accordingly are the loans contemplated in the present law.—**20 (19).** *Thou shalt not make thy brother give interest* (נֶשֶׁךְ), *interest of money, interest of victuals, interest of anything off which interest is given*] Ex. $22^{24\,(25)}$ (JE) "If thou lend (תַּלְוֶה) money to my people, even him that is poor with thee, thou shalt not be to him as a creditor [on 15^{2}]; ye shall not lay interest (נֶשֶׁךְ) upon him"; Lev. $25^{36\text{f.}}$ (H) "Take thou of him (thy impoverished brother, v.^{35}) no interest or increase (נֶשֶׁךְ וְתַרְבִּית); but fear thy God, that thy brother may live with thee. Thy money thou shalt not give him for interest; and for increase thou shalt not give (him) thy victuals." "Usury" (AV., RV.), it need hardly be said, is not used in the OT. in the modern sense of the term, of exorbitant interest, but (in accordance with its general usage in old English) of interest generally (whether reasonable or exorbitant). The Heb. verb נָשַׁךְ means commonly *to bite*: hence נֶשֶׁךְ is, no doubt, properly something *bitten off* the sum lent, in modern parlance, *interest.* Interest is mentioned elsewhere in the OT.—always with reprobation—Ez. $18^{8.\,13.\,17}$ 22^{12} Ps. 15^{5} Pr. 28^{8}.—*Interest of money, &c.*] cf. Neh. 5^{10}.—**21 (20).** *Unto a foreigner, &c.*] comp. 15^{3}.—*May bless thee, &c.*] $14^{29\text{b}}$ $24^{19\text{b}}$; 12^{7}.—*In the land, &c.*] 7^{1} $11^{10.\,29}$.

In condemning the practice of taking interest on money lent, Hebrew legislation agreed with the thinkers of Greece and Rome (Plato, *Legg.* v. 742; Arist. *Pol.* i. 10. 5; Cato, *ap.* Cic. *de Off.* ii. 25;—Arist., for instance, arguing, in view of its Greek name τόκος, that money being naturally *barren*, to extract *offspring* from it must be *contrary to nature*); and the same opinion was shared largely in the early Christian Church. The change of sentiment

20. לא תשיך לאחיך וג׳] lit. (as it seems) "thou shalt not make thy brother *bite off*, *a biting* of silver, &c., even a *biting* of anything off which one *biteth*," viz. for the purpose of giving to the lender what is so "bitten off" from the principal lent. Comp. Hab. 2^{9}, where there is a play on the double meaning of the verb: the Chaldæan (v.^{6}) "increases what is not his" (cf. Pr. 28^{8}), *i.e.* treats the nations subject to him as a usurer: these then rise up against him as his "debtors," but also as those who will "bite" him (נשכיך), *i.e.* requite him painfully for his extortions. "In Arabic there is a parallel expression 'to eat usury.' For the connexion in which נשך here appears there is a curious parallel in Ḥadīth Bokhārī, vii. 60 of the Būlāq vocalized edition, where the price of blood, the price of a dog, and the 'eating of usury' are forbidden together. I think this is merely curious; probably the Ḥadith is due to Jewish influence" (W.R.S.).

Digitized by Google

which has supervened in modern times is due partly to a clearer perception of the nature and use of money, partly to the fact that the purposes for which loans are now required, are (as a rule) different from those for which they were needed in ancient societies. In modern times loans are required principally by merchants and other traders, for the purpose of developing an industry by increasing the capital with which it is worked; and the increased capital bringing with it an increased income, it is both natural and proper that a reasonable payment should be made for the accommodation, just as would be done for the loan (*i.e.* the hire) of a house, or of any other commodity. In ancient times, however, commercial relations were comparatively undeveloped, and loans were commonly needed for the purpose of relieving distress (cf. Ex. $22^{24\,(25)}$); the borrower was not a solvent man, able and willing to pay a price for what, as he well knew, would enable him to extend his business with profit to himself, but a man reduced to poverty by misfortune and debt, to exact interest from whom seemed tantamount to making gain out of a neighbour's need. The loans on which interest was prohibited, were thus originally not advances of money needed for the development of a commercial industry, but advances intended for the relief of destitution (cf. p. 178); a system of commercial loans (as distinguished from charitable loans) was only introduced gradually; and even when it was introduced, it was still long before it was clearly seen that the two stood upon different footings, and that interest on the former (provided its rate was not exorbitant) was legitimate and just. But the feeling with which the ancients regarded all interest, is of course still rightly maintained towards excessive, or usurious interest. Cf. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, Part ii. ch. xi. pp. 311–315, 356 f. By the later Jews the practice of taking interest was strongly condemned (Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. f. Bibel u. Talm.* i. *s.v.* ZINS; supplementary volume, *s.v.* WUCHER), and abstention from it was considered so meritorious that it was deemed tantamount to accepting "the yoke of the kingdom of heaven" (*Siphra*, p. 109^c, on Lev. 25^{37}). In Mt. 25^{27} (the parable of the talents) it is mentioned without any mark of disapproval.

22–24 (21–23). On vows.—A vow, once made, is to be religiously performed: but being an obligation incurred voluntarily, it is no sin to a man if he does not make one. The habit of making vows, *i.e.* of promising solemnly before God to offer a sacrifice, or perform some other religious duty, in case a prayer or other earnest desire be granted, was a common one in antiquity; and many instances are recorded in the OT. (Gn. 28^{20} Nu. 21^2 Jud. 11^{30} 1 S. 1^{11} 2 S. $15^{7f.}$); hence it is not more than natural that laws should have been framed for the purpose of regulating the practice, and defining the conditions under which a vow should be valid. No legislation on the subject is however contained in JE; in P, the conditions under which vows are valid are defined in Nu. 30, the passage which

Digitized by Google

is parallel to the present law being v.$^{3\,(2)}$, which lays down the principle that a vow made by a man is in all cases binding (the rest of the chapter specifying the conditions under which vows made by women are, or are not, binding). The *place* at which all vows are to be paid, has been stated previously in Dt. $12^{6.11.17.26}$.—**22** (21). *When thou shalt vow a vow unto Jehovah thy God, thou shalt not delay to pay it*] Nu. $30^{3\,(2)}$ "When a man voweth a vow unto Jehovah, or sweareth an oath to bind a bond upon his soul (himself), he shall not profane his word: according to all that goeth forth out of his mouth shall he do." Not only is the vow to be performed as it was promised, the performance of it is not to be unduly deferred. Much stress is laid in the prophetic and poetical books on the payment (שַׁלֵּם, lit. *to make whole*, i.e. *make good, pay fully*) of vows, partly as a duty to be promptly rendered, partly as implying the welcome fact that the hope or desire, which inspired the vow, has been gratified: see Is. 19^{21} Nah. 2^{1} (1^{15}) Jon. 2^{10} Ps. 22^{26} 50^{14} 56^{13} 61^{9} 65^{2} $66^{13f.}$ 76^{12} $116^{14.18}$ Job 22^{27}; comp. also (based on this and the next verse) Eccl. $5^{3f.\,(4f.)}$. Warnings against precipitate vows are given in Pr. 20^{25} Eccl. $5^{5\,(6)}$.—*Require it of thee*] 18^{19}.—*And it will be sin in thee*] viz. if thou do not pay it: cf. v.$^{23\,(22)}$ 15^{9}.—**24** (23). *The utterance* (8^{3}) *of thy lips* (מוֹצָא שְׂפָתֶיךָ)] or "that which is gone forth out of thy lips." The expression is used of a solemn declaration or promise; Nu. $30^{13\,(12)}$ Ps. 89^{35} Jer. 17^{16}: cf. the cogn. verb, Nu. $30^{3\,(2)}$ 32^{24} Jer. 44^{17} Is. 45^{23}; and מוֹצָא פִּי י׳ c. 8^{3}.—*Observe and do*] 4^{6}.—*According as thou hast vowed freely unto Jehovah thy God that which thou hast spoken* (*promised*) *with thy mouth*] the words are explanatory of the preceding מוצא שפתיך; whatever has been voluntarily offered to Jehovah in the vow, is to be duly rendered to Him. נְדָבָה, it seems, must be taken adverbially (Hos. $14^{5\,(4)}$); it is against the rend. of RV., that a "free-will offering" was made under different conditions from a vow, and is mentioned as something distinct from it (Dt. $12^{6.17}$ Lev. 7^{16} *al.*).—*Spoken with thy mouth*] cf. 1 K. $8^{15.24}$ Jer. 44^{25}.

25–26 (24–25). Regard to be shown for a neighbour's crops.

22. דרש מעם] 18^{19}.

Digitized by Google

—The Israelite, as he passes through a neighbour's vineyard, may pick and eat the grapes, as he goes along, but may not carry any away in a vessel; similarly, as he passes through a neighbour's cornfield, he may pluck the ears with his hand, but must not cut off any with a sickle. Both laws are peculiar to Dt. They are adapted to check an avaricious spirit on either side. The owner of a vineyard, or field of grain, is not to grudge the passer-by a few grapes or ears of corn, if he plucks them as he walks along (comp. the case of the gleaners, 24^{19-21}); on the other hand, the passer-by is not to take advantage of the liberty thus granted to him, for the purpose of enriching himself unreasonably at his neighbour's expense.—**25 (24).** *At thine own pleasure*] lit. *according to thy soul*, *i.e.* thy appetite; cf. Pr. 13^{25} (צַדִּיק אֹכֵל לְשֹׂבַע נַפְשׁוֹ) Ps. 107^{9} Is. 58^{11}, and on 12^{20} 14^{26}.—**26 (25).** The disciples of Jesus were justified by this law in what they did in the cornfields, Mt. 12^{1} Lk. 6^{1}. The Rabbinical teachers of Christ's day, however, treated "plucking" as a species of reaping, and "rubbing" (Lk. 6^{1}) as a species of threshing; hence both came under the category of "work" or "business" (מלאכה), and were pronounced unlawful on the Sabbath day. See Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, ii. 56, 780. The same licence is still granted in Palestine (Rob. *BR*. i. 493, 499).

XXIV. 1–4. On divorce. A divorced woman, after contracting a second marriage, is not to be re-married to her former husband.—The rend. of AV., RV., is not here quite exact; v.$^{1-3}$ form the protasis, stating the conditions of the case contemplated, v.^{4} is the apodosis. The law is thus not, properly speaking, a law of divorce: the right of divorce is assumed, as established by custom (comp. $22^{19.29}$, two cases in which the right is forfeited); but definite legal formalities are prescribed, and restrictions are imposed, tending to prevent its being lightly or rashly exercised (see p. 272). There is no corresponding law in the other Codes of the Pent.; like Dt., H and P take the custom of divorce for granted (Lev. $21^{7.14}$ 22^{13} Nu. $30^{10(9)}$); but they contain no legislation

25. שבעך] accus. of manner: cf. אכל לשׂבע Lev. 25^{19} 26^{5}.—**26.** חניף] Ex. 20^{25} Jos. 8^{31} Is. 10^{15}.

Digitized by Google

respecting it. The law of Dt. is quoted, and applied didactically, in Jer. 3^{1} (in v.^{1b} read as RV. *marg.*).—**1–4.** Render: "When a man taketh a wife, and marrieth her, and it cometh to pass, if she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found in her some indecency, that he writeth her a bill of divorce, and delivereth it into her hand, and sendeth her out of his house, (**2**) and she departeth out of his house, and goeth and becometh another man's wife, (**3**) and the latter husband hateth her and writeth her a bill of divorce, and delivereth it into her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband, which took her to be his wife, die; (**4**) her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled."—**1.** ***Find no favour in his eyes***] a common Hebrew expression: Gn. 6^{8} 18^{3} 19^{19} &c. —***Because he hath found in her some indecency***] the feeling prompting a husband to divorce his wife must rest upon a definite and substantial ground. The expression rendered "indecency" (עֶרְוַת דָּבָר) has occurred before in $23^{15\,(14)}$; it is lit. *the nakedness of a thing*, and signifies most probably some improper or indecent behaviour (𝕲 ἄσχημον πρᾶγμα).

The expression is a peculiar one; and different views have been held as to what is denoted by it. Of the Jewish legalists, the school of Shammai (1 cent. B.C.), pressing the word "nakedness," understood it of unchastity, the school of Hillel, pressing (in Rabbinical fashion) the word "thing," and the clause "if she find no favour in his eyes" (though this, as a matter of fact, is qualified by the following words, "*because* he finds some indecency in her"), supposed the most trivial causes to be included, declaring, for instance, that a wife might be divorced, even if she burnt her husband's food (אפילו הקדיחה תבשילו), or if he saw a woman who pleased him better (*Giṭṭin*, ix. 10: cf. Mt. 19^{3} εἰ . . . κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν; Jos. *Ant.* iv. 8. 23 καθ' ἁσδηποτοῦν αἰτίας). It may however be doubted how far the latter opinion was literally acted upon. The grounds mentioned in the Mishnah as justifying divorce are, violation of the law of Moses, or of Jewish customs, the former being said to consist in a woman's causing her husband to eat food, on which tithe has not been paid; in causing him to offend against the law of Lev. 18^{19}, in not setting apart the first of the dough (Nu. $15^{20f.}$), and in failing to perform any vow which she has made; and the latter in appearing in public with dishevelled hair, spinning (and exposing her arms) in the streets, and conversing indiscriminately with men, to which others added, speaking disrespectfully of her husband's parents in his presence, or brawling in his house (*Kethuboth* vii. 6). The Ḳaraite Jews limited the grounds of divorce more exclusively to offences against modesty or good taste, a change of religion, serious

Digitized by Google

bodily defects, and repulsive complaints (see Ad. Neubauer, *Aus der Petersb. Bibliothek*, 1866, pp. נר, 101; Aaron ben Elia, *Gan 'Eden*, p. קנר *b*, c. 24 of סדר נשים). That the ערות דבר denotes something short of actual unchastity, may be inferred from the fact that for this a different penalty is enacted, viz. death (22^{22}); in $23^{15\,(14)}$, also, the same expression is used, not of what is immoral, but only of what is unbecoming. It is most natural to understand it of *immodest* or *indecent behaviour*.

Writeth her a bill of divorce (סֵפֶר כְּרִיתֻת)] lit. *a writ of cutting off* (cf. Sir. 25^{26} ἀπότεμε), or *separation* (𝔊 βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, as Mt. 5^{31} 19^{7} Mk. 10^{4}): so v.[3] Jer. 3^{8} Is. 50^{1}†. The husband's determination to divorce his wife must be attested by a properly formulated legal document.—*And delivereth it into her hand*] so v.[3]. The deed must, so to say, be formally served upon the wife. The conditions which a deed of divorce (called in post-Biblical Hebrew a *Geṭ*), in order to be valid, must satisfy, and the formalities to be observed for its due delivery to the woman, as defined by the later Jews, are stated at length in the treatise of the Mishnah called *Giṭṭin*.—*And sendeth her away* (וְשִׁלְּחָהּ) *out of his house*] a third formality (so v.[3]): the woman must be sent forth formally, by her husband, out of his house. שִׁלַּח *to send away* or *dismiss* is the usual Heb. word for divorce; cf. v.[4] $22^{19.\,29}$ Is. 50^{1} Mal. 2^{16}. A divorced woman is גְּרוּשָׁה, lit. *one driven out, expelled* (Lev. 21^{14} 22^{13} Nu. 30^{10} Ez. 44^{22}†); but the verb גרשׁ is not found in this sense (Gn. 21^{10} being scarcely an instance). The right of divorce, it will be noticed, rests solely with the husband; no provision is made for the case of a wife seeking redress for her husband's misbehaviour. By the later Jews, the wife was permitted in certain cases to claim a divorce, viz. if her husband were a leper, or afflicted with a polypus, or engaged in a repulsive trade (*Kethuboth*, vii. 10).—**3.** *Hate her*] cf. 22^{13}. The expression, which includes no reference to a positive offence on the woman's part, might be taken to show that a husband could divorce his wife upon slight and arbitrary grounds; but as a second husband would hardly enjoy greater liberty of divorce than a first, it is only reasonable to interpret it in the light of v.[1], as implying some impropriety as its

XXIV 2. והיתה ל] prop. *come to belong to, become the property of*: of a woman, the standing expression for *to be married to*: Jud. 14^{20} 15^{2} *al.*

Digitized by Google

occasion.—4. *After that she is defiled*] the union of a divorced woman with another man, from the point of view of her first husband, falling into the same category as adultery, to which this term is applied (Lev. 18^{20} Nu. $5^{13.\,14.\,20}$). "The marriage of a divorced woman is thus treated implicitly as tantamount to adultery, and the way is prepared for the teaching of Christ on the subject of marriage, ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ μοιχᾶται Mt. 5^{32}" (Keil).—*An abomination before Jehovah*] a variation of the usual expression "Jehovah's abomination" (on 7^{25}); "before" as v.[13] Gn. 7^{1}.—*And thou shalt not cause the land to sin*] cf. Jer. 3^{1}. The land is conceived by the Hebrews as in moral sympathy with the people living upon it, and is thus almost personified (Ez. 14^{13} Is. 24^{20b}); it is "polluted" under its inhabitants (Is. 24^{5}), and "defiled" by their immoralities (Lev. 18^{25}). Here *to sin* denotes (or at least includes) to incur the guilt and consequences of sin; cf. Is. 29^{21} Eccl. 5^{5}; and the subst. *sin* (חטא) in 15^{9}.—*Is giving thee*] 4^{21}.

Hebrew law, as remarked above, does not institute divorce, but tolerates it, in view of the imperfections of human nature (πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν, Mt. 19^{8}), and lays down regulations tending to limit it, and preclude its abuse. Thus the law of Dt. provides *three* guarantees against rash or arbitrary divorce: a definite and substantial ground must be alleged; a proper legal instrument must be prepared; and the case (it is implied) must be brought before some public functionary, who would not only secure the due observance of the requisite legal formalities, but also take care that the grounds alleged were sufficient, and consider any defence that might be offered. The deed, moreover, in order that the divorce may be legally valid, must be delivered into the wife's hand, and she must be formally sent by her husband out of his house. It is evident that the time and expense involved in these formalities would tend to check a divorce suit being rashly instituted; the husband would have opportunity for reconsideration, and the intervention of a public magistrate would prevent proceedings being instituted upon wanton or frivolous grounds. The further provision in Dt. that a divorced woman who had married a second time, should not return to her former husband, would operate similarly as a deterrent from hasty divorce, or, if the divorce had actually taken place, it would lead the husband to consider the possibility of taking his wife back, while he was still at liberty to do so, viz. before she had bound herself to a second husband; it would also be of value in a different direction by checking, on the part of a woman desirous of returning to her former home, the temptation to intrigue against her second husband. In

4. הֻטַּמָּאָה] G-K. § $54^{c.\,h}$; Stade, § 165: the pausal form (for הֻטַּמְּאָה) on account of the *Zaqef* (cf. on 7^{5}).

Digitized by Google

two cases the right of divorce is withheld, viz. where a man slanders his newly-married wife as unchaste, or seduces her before marriage ($22^{19.\,29}$), the ground, no doubt, being, in the former case, that a husband guilty of such a mean attempt to get rid of his wife deserved to forfeit the right altogether, and in the latter case, that a woman who had been so treated had a claim to special consideration at her husband's hands, and should not be exposed to the additional disgrace of a divorce.

Malachi ($2^{13\text{-}16}$) deplores the frequency of divorce in his day, and declares that it is hateful to Jehovah. The Rabbis in a later age discouraged the practice as much as they could do: at the same time, the passages from the Mishnah cited above, show that it was permitted upon grounds which, judged by a Christian standard, would be deemed insufficient; and perhaps the indistinctness of the expression used in Dt. may have contributed to this laxity. Comp. the counsel of Sir. $25^{25f.}$ *μὴ δῷς ὕδατι διέξοδον, μηδὲ γυναικὶ πονηρᾷ ἐξουσίαν· εἰ μὴ πορεύεται κατὰ χεῖρά σου, ἀπὸ τῶν σαρκῶν σου ἀπότεμε αὐτήν* (see also $7^{26\,(28)}$ 42^{9}).

The minuter regulations of the later Jews, on the subject of divorce, are contained chiefly in the Mishnic treatises *Kethuboth* (i.e. *marriage-contracts*) and *Giṭṭin*,—both translated in De Sola and Raphall, *Eighteen Treatises of the Mishna*, 1843: see further Saalschütz, *Mos. Recht*, p. 799 ff.; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, ii. 332–334; Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. f. Bibel u. Talm.* i. *s.v.* SCHEIDEN, ii. *s.v.* SCHEIDUNG (where the formalities that must be observed in the preparation of a legal *Geṭ* are enumerated); Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.*[3] iii. 89 f. The legal form of a *Geṭ* may be seen in Selden, *Uxor Hebr.* (1673) p. 369 f.; Surenhusius, *Mishna*, iii. 323, 325 f.; Hamburger, ii. *l.c.*; cf. also *Giṭṭin*, ix. 3. For two interesting specimens of ancient *Kethuboth* (A.D. 1095 and 1164) see A. Merx, *Documents de Paléographie Hebr. et Arabe* (1894), p. 35 ff.—On divorce-customs in other countries, see Post, *Familienrecht*, p. 249 ff.

5. No military service, or other public duty, is to be imposed upon a man during the first year after his marriage. —Peculiar to Dt. The law is analogous to those in $20^{5\text{-}7}$, and is prompted by the same spirit of consideration for a man's domestic relations, and the same unwillingness to interfere with them unnecessarily.—*Neither shall any business be imposed upon him*] lit. *pass over upon him* (Job 13^{13}): *i.e.* his services are not to be requisitioned for any public purpose.—*He shall be free* (נָקִי) *for his house for one year*] *i.e.* exempted (1 K. 15^{22}) from other duties, and free to attend to the interests of his new home.

6. The mill, or the upper millstone, not to be taken in

5. לכל דבר] ל (=*as regards*) is here very peculiar, though there are some approximate parallels in late Heb., 1 Ch. $28^{1b.\,21}$ 29^{6b} 2 Ch. 7^{21} (‖ 1 K. 9^{8} without ל): *Lex.* ל **5** e *e.*—**6.** הוא] *he*,—such a one as is mentioned in cl.[a] (Job 13^{28}).

Digitized by Google

pledge.—The hand-mill is an article in every household in the East: it is indispensable for keeping the family supplied with food; and every morning its dull, grating sound is heard throughout an Eastern village (cf. Jer. 25[10] Rev. 18[22]). The law is analogous to the one in v.[12-13]; and like it imposes a wholesome limitation on the power exercised by the creditor over the debtor: how liable this power was to be abused may be inferred from such passages as Am. 2[8] Pr. 22[27] Job 22[6].—*The mill, or the upper millstone*] *i.e.* either the whole mill, or even the upper millstone alone (which revolves upon the lower stone, and without which, of course, the mill is useless). The *hand-mill* (רֵחַיִם) consists of two flat circular stones, worked usually by two women (Mt. 24[41]) seated on the ground, as anciently by female slaves (Ex. 11[5] Is. 47[2]); the work being hard, and deemed degrading, was not performed by men except such as were captives (Jud. 16[21] Lam. 5[13]). The "upper millstone" (רֶכֶב, lit. the "chariot," or rider) is mentioned also Jud. 9[53] (2 S. 11[21]).—*For he* (emph.: viz. one that doeth this) *taketh a life* (*soul*) *in pledge*] the hand-mill, as just said, supplying a family with its daily bread, and so being tantamount to the life of those dependent upon it.

7. Against man-stealing.—A man discovered to have stolen, and sold into slavery, a brother-Israelite is to be punished with death. The law is virtually a repetition of Ex. 21[16] in JE, the phraseology being merely recast in the Deuteronomic mould.—*If a man be found* (21[1] 22[22]) *stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel, and he play the master over him* (21[14]), *and sell him, then that thief shall die*] Ex. 21[16] "He that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he (*i.e.* the man stolen) be found in his hand, shall surely be put to death." In Dt. the object of the verb "stealeth" is expressly limited to an Israelite. By *sell him* is no doubt meant sell him into slavery in a foreign land.—*Brethren*] 15[2].—*So thou shalt exterminate, &c.*] 13[6 (5)].

8–9. On leprosy.—In dealing with the plague of leprosy, the Israelites are to attend carefully to the directions given to them by the Levitical priests; and to bear also in mind what

7. נפש]=*person*, as 10[22] and often.

Digitized by Google

Jehovah did to Miriam, as they came forth out of Egypt (Nu. $12^{14f.}$). In JE no provision is made for the treatment of leprosy; but in the Priests' Code the subject is handled with great minuteness, in view of the different cases that are likely to arise, in two long chapters, Lev. 13–14. The law, as it stands here, cannot be taken as proof that Lev. 13–14 existed in its present shape at the time when Dt. was written; but it is sufficient evidence both that a *Tôrah* on the subject was in the possession of the priests, and that the principles which it embodied were of recognized authority, and referred to a divine origin ("as I have commanded them").—**8.** *Take heed*] cf. 4^{9}.—*The plague* (נֶגַע) *of leprosy*] lit. *touch* or *stroke* (17^{8} 21^{5}),—here of the physical *mark* (πληγή) produced by a malignant complaint (cf. 1 K. 8^{37} Ps. 91^{10}), and a standing expression in Lev. 13–14 (v.$^{2.3.9}$ &c.); cf. the cogn. verb, 2 K. 15^{5}.—*Observe . . . and do*] 4^{6}.—*According to all that the priests the Levites* (18^{1}) *shall direct you*] 17^{10b} (where obedience to the "direction" of the priests is similarly enjoined): the verb is the one (הוֹרָה) used of the technical "direction," given by the priests (cf. on 17^{10}); and the regulations contained in Lev. 13–14 are called by the corresponding subst., the *Tôrah* of leprosy (13^{59} $14^{32.54.57}$).—ככל] 𝔊 Sam. ככל התורה.—*As I have commanded them*] the first person, of Jehovah, as 7^{4}.—*Observe to do*] 5^{1}.—**9.** *Remember, &c.*] cf. 7^{18b}; and esp. 25^{17}.—*Unto Miriam*] see Nu. 12 (JE). A solemn admonition to remember not only how Miriam was suddenly smitten with leprosy, but also how seriously it was treated, Miriam being excluded from the camp for seven days (Nu. $12^{14f.}$).—*By the way, &c.*] $23^{5(4)}$ 25^{17}.

10–13. On pledges.—When an Israelite lends to his neighbour on the security of a pledge, he is not to go into the house for the purpose of fetching his pledge; the right of selecting the article offered is to remain with the borrower. And if the borrower be a poor man, and offer his mantle as the pledge, it is to be restored to him at sunset, in order that he

8. השמר ב] *in, i.e.* in the matter of (Ex. 23^{13} 2 S. 20^{10}), when the case arises; not *against* (𝔙, Schultz, Keil), which would be מן (23^{10} Jud. 13^{13} Jer. 9^{3}), not ב.—**10.** חשה] 15^{2}.—לעבט עבטו] *for him to give his pledge* (cf. on 15^{6}),—with a change of subj., as sometimes happens with the inf. (4^{5}).

Digitized by Google

may not be deprived of his covering for the night. Loans on interest ($23^{20f.}$) are forbidden: but loans on the security of a pledge are permitted; and the two present provisions are designed to prevent the creditor's abusing his legitimate rights, or enforcing them vexatiously (Job 22^{6} 24^{3}). The second is based upon Ex. $22^{25f. (26f.)}$: the first is peculiar to Dt., and like those in v.$^{6. 17b}$, is intended as a further restriction on the arbitrary power of the creditor. The terms of both provisions show that commercial and monetary transactions (cf. p. 178) are still of a relatively simple character.—**12.** *And if he be a poor man, thou shalt not sleep in his pledge*] as the next verse shows, the pledge contemplated is a mantle (שַׂלְמָה)—perhaps the only article that a poor man would have at his disposal for the purpose, as well as his only covering by night (Ex. $22^{26 (27)}$). So Ex. $22^{25 (26)}$ "If thou take thy neighbour's mantle (שַׂלְמָה) to pledge, thou shalt restore it to him against sunset." A garment was a common article to offer as a pledge (24^{17} Am. 2^{8} Pr. 20^{16} 27^{13} Job 22^{6}); and the *salmāh* (or *simlāh*) was the large quadrangular over-mantle, or plaid (cf. on 22^{17}), which was used for sleeping in, and for other purposes (Ex. 12^{34} Jud. 8^{25} 1 S. 21^{10}). On the duty of restoring pledges, see also Ez. $18^{7. 12}$ 33^{15}.—*And to thee it shall be righteousness*] 6^{25}.

14–15. Justice towards hired servants.—The wages of a poor hired servant are not to be withheld from him after the time when they are due; they are to be paid to him regularly at the end of his day's labour. One of the many laws in which Dt. abounds, not less than the codes of JE and H, inculcating equity and consideration towards those in a position of dependence or want. The parallel in H is Lev. 19^{13b}.—*Thou shalt not oppress* (or *defraud*)] עָשַׁק is used specially of oppression by robbery or fraud: $28^{29. 33}$ 1 S. $12^{3. 4}$ Am. 4^{1} Ez. 18^{18} 22^{29} Mal. 3^{5} (עֹשְׁקֵי שְׂכַר שָׂכִיר).—*Of thy brethren, or of thy strangers, &c.*] the expressions are Deuteronomic (15^{2} 12^{12} 31^{12}).—**15.** *In his day, &c.*] Lev. 19^{13b} "the wages of an hired servant shall not remain all night with thee until the morning.—

13. שלמה] as Ex. $22^{8. 25}$: Dt. usu. has שִׂמְלָה (8^{4} 10^{18} 21^{13} $22^{3. 5. 17}$), but שלמה 29^{4} (=8^{4}).—**14.** מִגֵּרְךָ] collect., as Lev. $17^{8. 10. 13}$ *al.*—**15.** תתן שכרו] without לו, idiomatically, as Gn. 30^{18} Ex. 2^{9} Jon. 1^{3}; Zc. 11^{12}.

Digitized by Google

Setteth his heart upon it] lit. *lifteth up his soul to it*, a Hebrew idiom signifying "setteth his desire upon it": cf. on 12^{20}, and see Hos. 4^{8} Jer. 22^{27} 44^{14} Ez. 24^{25} Ps. 24^{4}, and in a religious sense (with God as the object of desire) 25^{1} 143^{8}. With the thought, cf. Job 7^{2} 14^{6}.—*Lest he cry against thee unto Jehovah, and it be sin in thee*] 15^{9}: cf. Ex. $22^{22\,(23)}$.

16. Responsibility for a crime is to be confined to the criminal: his family are not to suffer with him.—Peculiar to Dt. Judged by a modern standard, this provision seems to be a superfluous one; for the practice prohibited appears to be inconsistent with the fundamental principles of justice: but in the light of ancient ideas, and ancient usage, it was by no means unnecessary. In ancient times the family was the unit of society, much more than the individual; the guilt, and not merely (as with us) the disgrace, of a crime perpetrated by an individual, was shared by the rest of his family; and it was only gradually that the doctrine of individual responsibility acquired recognition. Hence among ancient nations, especially in the East, the family of a criminal often suffered punishment with him (Est. $9^{13f.}$, Herod. iii. 119, Dan. $6^{25\,(24)}$). Whether the same custom prevailed in Israel can only be inferred by conjecture: the cases Jos. $7^{24f.}$ 2 S. $21^{1\text{-}9}$ are of an exceptional nature, and hardly authorize an inference as to the ordinary judicial procedure. But in 2 K. 14^{6} (where the present law is quoted by the compiler of Kings) Amaẓiah appears to be praised on account of his unusual clemency; and that there was felt to be a danger of the practice is shown by the existence of a law forbidding it.

The doctrine of individual responsibility is strongly insisted on by Ezekiel (c. 18). The principle of the present law has been asserted before, 7^{10}. It does not conflict with the teaching of 5^{9} (Ex. 20^{5}). There the reference is to the providence of God, operating naturally through the normal constitution of society: children are linked to their parents by ties, physical and social, from which they cannot free themselves; and they suffer, not because they are *guilty* of their fathers' sins, but because by the self-acting operation of natural laws their fathers' sins entail disgrace or misfortune upon them. Here a law is prescribed for *human action*, and a

---

16. על] may be either *for* (𝔊 ὑπὲρ) Jer. 15^{15} Ps. 69^{8} 44^{23}, or *together with* (on 23^{14}).—**16ᵇ.** יומת] 𝔊 Sam. 𝔙𝔖 מוּת; (so 2 K. 14^{6} Kt.), 𝔗 יְמוּתוּן: the difference is immaterial.

principle is laid down for the administration of justice by the State: the family of a criminal is not to be punished judicially with him. The two cases are thus altogether different: it is one thing that, in virtue of the physical and social conditions in which they live, children should suffer for their fathers' sins; it is another thing that, by the deliberate intervention of human authority, they should be punished for criminal acts which they have not committed. Cf. J. B. Mozley, *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*, Lect. iv. p. 111 ff.

17–18. The stranger and the fatherless not to be treated with injustice, nor the widow with hard-heartedness.—The same three typical classes of the necessitous and unprotected are again, as already in Ex. $22^{20f.\,(21f.)}$, and often elsewhere in Dt. (comp. on 14^{29}), commended to the considerate regard of the Israelite. Each of the two provisions is substantially the application to a special case of the general principle of Ex. $22^{20.\,21.\,25\,(21.\,22.\,26)}$ $23^{6.\,9}$ and Lev. $19^{33f.}$ (the stranger not to be oppressed).—*Thou shalt not wrest the judgment* (16^{19}) *of the stranger*, (or) *the fatherless*] Ex. 23^{6} "Thou shalt not wrest the judgment of the poor in his cause."—*Nor take the widow's garment to pledge*] a provision analogous to the one in v.^{6}. Comp. Job 24^{3}, where taking the widow's ox for a pledge is mentioned as a piece of oppressiveness side by side with removing landmarks, robbing flocks, and driving away the ass of the fatherless.—*But thou shalt remember, &c.*] the whole verse nearly as 15^{15}; cf. below, v.^{22}

19–22. Gleanings in the cornfield, the olive-garden, and the vineyard, are not to be claimed in a grasping spirit by the owner, but to be left for the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow.—The first and the third provisions agree substantially with Lev. $19^{9f.}$ 23^{22}, in the Law of Holiness, only the phrasing being Deuteronomic; the second is an extension of the same principle to the olive-garden.—**19.** *When thou reapest thine harvest, &c.*] cf. Lev. $19^{9.\,10b}$ ($= 23^{22}$).—*May bless thee, &c.*] 14^{29b} $23^{21\,(20)b}$.—**20.** *When thou beatest* (כי תחבט) *thine olive tree*] alluding to the method by which the fruit of the olive tree was collected; so Is. 27^{12}. Comp. the parallel expression, Is. 17^{6} 24^{13} כְּנֹקֶף זַיִת "as at the *striking* of an olive tree."—**21.** *When thou gatherest thy vineyard* (Jud. 9^{27}), *&c.*] cf. Lev. 19^{10a}.—**22.** *And thou shalt remember, &c.*] v.^{18} 15^{15}.

20. הפאר] denom. from פֹּארָה: the so-called *Piel privativum* (G-K. § 52. 2^{c}).

Digitized by Google

XXV. 1–3. Precautions against undue severity in the infliction of corporal punishment (the bastinado).—If a culprit be condemned by a lawful tribunal to be beaten with stripes, the sentence is to be carried out in presence of the judge, the stripes are to be counted one by one, and the entire number given is not to exceed forty. Peculiar to Dt. A provision both equitable and necessary in an age when little regard was apt to be paid to human suffering, and when corporal punishment was liable to be inflicted with extreme severity. The expression in v.[2] "cause *to lie down*" makes it probable that the particular punishment contemplated in the law is the bastinado, which was a common form of punishment in Egypt (Wilkinson-Birch, 1878, i. 305, 308; *HWB.*[1] 899^2, 914) and in other Eastern countries, and which lends itself with peculiar facility to abuse. The infliction of stripes is often alluded to in the OT. as an obvious and ordinary form of punishment, *e.g.* Ex. 21^{20} (which shows that a master would sometimes beat his slave with such violence as to cause his death), Pr. 10^{13} 17^{26} 19^{29} 26^3 (on the back; cf. Is. 50^6), Jer. 20^2 37^{15}: but it is nowhere described as authorized by law except here, and (probably) 22^{18}.—**1.** *They shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked*] comp. 1 K. 8^{32} (of God). *Righteous* and *wicked* are here used in their forensic sense, to signify righteous and wicked, in respect of the particular charge of which a person is accused, *i.e.* they are equivalent to *innocent* and *guilty* respectively; cf. Ex. 9^{27} 23^7. הִצְדִּיק and הִרְשִׁיעַ, lit. *make* (i.e. *declare*) *righteous* (innocent) and *wicked* (guilty), as 2 S. 15^4 Is. 5^{23} Ps. 82^3; Ex. $22^{8(9)}$ Ps. 37^{33} 94^{21}.—**2.** *Worthy to be beaten*] lit. *a child of beating* (בֶּן הַכּוֹת), by a well-known Hebrew idiom: comp. "a child of death" (בן מות) 1 S. 20^{31} *al.*—*To be beaten before his face, according to what is sufficient for his wickedness, by number*] provisions evidently adapted to protect the criminal against maltreatment: the punishment is not to be left to the discretion of subordinate officials, it is to be inflicted in the presence of the judge; the stripes are to be counted, not administered at random; and their number is to be strictly proportionate to the gravity of the offence.—**3.** A

XXV. 2. כדי ר'] cf. Lev. 25^{26}.

Digitized by Google

further limitation: the number of stripes is never to exceed forty.—*Forty stripes he may give him, he shall not exceed*] by the later Jews the number, to avoid the possibility of a mistake, was fixed at 39 (אַרְבָּעִים חָסֵר אַחַת *Maccoth*, iii. 10 ff., where the process is described; 2 Cor. 11^{24} Jos. *Ant.* iv. 8. 21, 23).—*Thy brother*] the term is here used with force; see on 15^{2}.—*Be dishonoured*] on the idea expressed by נִקְלָה, see on 27^{16}. The meaning is that an excessive punishment is a humiliation inconsistent with the respect that is due to a human being; it brings with it a degradation which even a criminal does not deserve.—*Before thy eyes*] aggravating the indignity; cf. on 1^{30}. (*Seem* of AV. RV. is incorrect: see below.)

4. The ox not to be muzzled, while he is treading out the corn.—Peculiar to Dt. The law affords another example of the humanity which is characteristic of Dt., and which is to be exercised even towards animals (cf. probably $22^{6f.}$; and Pr. 12^{10}). 1 Cor. 9^{9} 1 Tim. 5^{18} the law is quoted, in illustration of the principle that "the labourer is worthy of his hire." The custom of threshing corn in the manner here alluded to, prevails still in the East. The ears of corn are spread out upon the threshing floor, the oxen, yoked together in pairs, are led by a rope, or made to move round a pivot in the centre, and their hoofs passing over the ears, separate the grain from the husk. See *DB*[2]. i. 65 (in Egypt); Thomson, *The Land and the Book* (1881), i. p. 153 f. (at Yebna); Rob. *BR*. i. 550 (near Jericho: here the oxen of the Christians were muzzled, those of the Moslems unmuzzled). Oxen (or other animals) still thresh unmuzzled "in Mauretania (Hoest, *Marok.* p. 129), Mesopotamia (Buckingham, *Mesop.* i. 418), Syria (Russell, *Aleppo*,[2] i. 76), Arabia and Palestine (Wellsted, *Reisen in Arabien*, 1842, i. 194; Lynch, *Narrative*, 1852, p. 218)" (Knob.). Conder (*Tent Work*, 1887, p. 329) says, "I have seen them muzzled, though this is rare."

5–10. The law of Levirate-marriage.—If there are two brothers living as neighbours, and one die leaving no son, his

3. פן יוסיף וג׳] RV. "lest, *if*," &c.: see on 8^{12}.—נקלה לעיניך] not "should *seem* vile unto thee": "in the eyes (=judgment) of" is בעיני (*e.g.* Gn. 19^{14}): לעיני is always *before*, *in view of* (*e.g.* v.[9]).

Digitized by Google

widow is not to be married into another family, the surviving brother is to take her as his wife, and the eldest child born to them is to succeed to the name and inheritance of the deceased brother, v.[5-6]. In case the surviving brother declines to do this, a formal declaration to that effect is to be made by both of them before the elders of the city, after which the widow is to loosen her brother-in-law's sandal from his foot in token that he has formally renounced his right, and to express publicly, by word and gesture, the contempt which he deserves for having failed to discharge this duty towards his deceased brother, v.[7-10]. Peculiar to Dt. The motive of the law is obvious. It is to prevent the extinction of a family; for it was deemed a disaster if a man, who had once secured for himself a wife and home, should be left without a descendant to perpetuate his name. As however in so many other cases, the law of Dt. does not create a new institution, but merely codifies an old one. The Levirate-marriage must have been an ancient tribal institution in Israel; for the duty of a surviving brother to marry his brother's childless widow is in Gen. 38 (see esp. v.[8. 14b. 26]) presupposed for the patriarchal age. But the institution is not confined to the Hebrews: with modifications in detail, the custom by which it becomes the duty of a surviving brother to marry his deceased brother's wife (or wives), and to make provision for his children, is a widely-diffused one, which prevails among very many different nations, and under the most different systems of relationship (for instance, kinship through women, not less than kinship through men).* The Hebrew institution, however, differs from the normal Levirate-marriage in three respects—(1) it was limited to the case where the deceased left no male issue; (2) even then it was only put in force when the two brothers were dwelling on the same family estate; (3) the surviving brother, though he took his deceased brother's widow as his wife, and enjoyed during his lifetime (so far as appears) his

* See the long list of peoples cited by Westermarck, *Hist. of Human Marriage*, p. 510f.; and the very clear synopsis, with fuller details, in A. H. Post's brochure, *Einl. in das Stud. der Ethnol. Jurisprudenz* (1886), pp. 28-47; also (for Africa) *Afrik. Jurisprudenz* (1887), pp. 419-425.

Digitized by Google

brother's estate, did not found a family for himself: the issue of the marriage succeeded to the name and estate of the deceased brother. Similar limitations prevail in India, Madagascar, and among the Calchaquis of Brazil. Hindu law restricts the practice to the case in which the deceased leaves no issue of either sex; but the union with the widow cannot here be termed a marriage, for it is only permitted to continue as long as may be necessary to ensure the birth of a single son,* its special aim being merely to provide an heir who may be qualified to perform duly certain sacrificial rites in honour of the deceased.† In Madagascar it is the duty of a younger brother to raise up seed to his elder brother in case he dies childless.‡—**5.** *Dwell together*] *i.e.* on the same family estate (Gn. 13⁶ 36⁷ do not illustrate the usage here): when the members of the family were separated, the law did not apply. It was a collateral object of the institution to prevent a family inheritance from being broken up, and (see the next clause but one) passing into strange hands.—*And have no son*] this is the natural meaning of the Hebrew (בן), and it is so understood by Onq., Knob., Ew., Dillm., Oettli, Benzinger, *Arch.* p. 346, Nowack, *Arch.* i. 345, RV.; but 𝔊 (σπέρμα) understands בן in the general sense of *child* (of either sex); so Jos. *Ant.* iv. 8. 23, and in the quotation by the Sadducees, Mt. 22^{24} (=Mk. 12^{19}=Lk. 20^{28}), 𝔙, Rabb., Schultz, Keil, *al.* Had this, however, been intended, *seed*, or *son or daughter*, would, as Dillm. remarks, have been certainly said in legal phraseology.—*Without* (Jud. 12^{6}) *to a stranger*] *i.e.* to a man belonging to another family or clan: she was to remain (with her property) in her own family.—*Perform the duty of an husband's brother unto her*] the idea conveyed by these words is expressed in the Heb. by a single word, a verb derived from the Hebrew term for "husband's brother" (יָבָם), viz. וְיִבְּמָהּ, *i.e.* "*treat her as a* יָבָם, or *husband's brother*" (so Gn. 38^{8}). The fact of Heb.

5. ל . . . תהיה] 24^{2}.—יבא עליה] Gn. 19^{31}: usu. בא אל.

* *Institutes of Manu*, v. 59–63; Mayne, *Hindu Law and Usage*,[4] 1883, §§ 68–69. Actual marriage with the widow, however, prevails among particuliar tribes of India (*ib.* § 70).

† Cf. on this duty, Maine, *Early Law and Custom*, chaps. iii.–iv.

‡ Sibree, *The Great African Island*, 1880, p. 246.

Digitized by Google

possessing a special word to indicate this particular relation is evidence that it must have been a prominent factor in ancient Hebrew society, and that the rights and duties connected with it must have been important ones.—**6.** *Shall succeed to the name of his brother that is dead*] lit. "*stand up upon* the name," &c., *i.e.* assume a position (or be established) as his heir, and the perpetuator of his name and family.—*That his name be not blotted out from Israel*] comp. for the figure 9^{14} 29^{19} Ps. 9^{6} 109^{13}; for the thought Ru. $4^{5.\,10}$ 1 S. $24^{22\,(21)}$ 2 S. 14^{7b}.—**7.** *Shall go up to the gate* (Ru. 4^{1}), *unto the elders*] in order that her brother-in-law's renunciation of his office may be officially attested and sanctioned: cf. 21^{19} 22^{15}.—*To raise up, &c.*] cf. Ru. $4^{5.\,10}$ (להקים שם המת על נחלתו).—**9.** *Then shall his brother's wife draw nigh unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his sandal from off his foot, and spit in his face; and she shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto the man that doth not build up his brother's house*] according to Ru. $4^{7f.}$, it was the custom in ancient Israel, when property was transferred, or a right ceded, to take off the sandal, and hand it to the person in whose favour the transfer or cession was made, as a symbolic attestation of the act, investing it with legal validity. Here the sandal is taken from the foot of the husband's brother, in token of his renunciation of the right which the law gave him over his deceased brother's wife (comp. the Bedouin form of divorce, "she was my *slipper*, and I have cast her off"; Smith, *Kinship*, p. 269); but it is removed not by himself, but by the woman, as an indication, apparently, that he allows an honourable privilege to be taken from him, and voluntarily renounces a duty which affection for a deceased brother should have made dear to him. The discredit which was felt to attach to his conduct, appears further from the contemptuous act which the woman is afterwards directed to perform (see Nu. 12^{14} Job 30^{10} Is. 50^{6}), and from the disparaging words with which she is to accompany it. For *build up*, cf. Ru. 4^{11}; also Gn. 16^{2} 30^{3} (RV. *m.*).—**10.** *And his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him*

9. בפניו] "*in* the face of" (in a hostile sense), as Nu. 12^{14}; c. 7^{24} (see note); Job 16^{8} Hos. 5^{5}. "Before" (*Jebāmōth*, 12^{6}; Rabb.; Espin) would be לפני.

that hath his sandal loosed] or, more pointedly, "of the unsandalled one,"—a contemptuous *soubriquet*, which will cling to his family, and perpetuate the recollection of his unbrotherly act.—יקרא שמו בישראל] Ru. 4^{14} (in a different application).

An institution so widely diffused as the Levirate-marriage must rest throughout upon some common basis, and be due to the operation of some common principle, or principles, influencing society. By J. F. McLennan* it was strongly contended that the peculiar position taken in it by the brother can be properly understood only as a survival from an antecedent *polyandrous* stage of society—in particular, of the kind known as Tibetan polyandry, in which a group of brothers living together share a single wife, and the children of the brotherhood are all (by a legal fiction) reckoned as belonging to the eldest brother. But though undoubtedly polyandry has prevailed, and prevails still, in many parts of the globe† (notably in Central Asia), the best independent judges are of opinion that McLennan greatly exaggerated its extent and importance as a stage in the development of society; and, in particular, that the usages connected with the Levirate-marriage, to which he appealed as evidence of its former existence, were not so conclusive as he supposed.‡ The institution of the Levirate-marriage, it is probable,§ originated in a state of society in which the constituent units were, more largely than with us, not single families, but *groups of related families*, or joint family groups. In primitive and semi-primitive societies women do not possess independent rights, they are treated as part of the property of the family to which they belong. A married woman, upon the death of her husband, passes consequently, with her children, and her late husband's estate, to the new head of the family, who assumes in relation to them the same rights and duties which the husband had: he holds towards them the joint position of guardian and owner; and this brings with it as a corollary the right to treat the widow as his wife. And it is the *brother* who thus becomes the deceased man's heir, because, from his age and position, he is (as a rule) the person who is best fitted to be the new head of the family, and the guardian of its

* *Studies in Anc. Hist.* 1888, p. 97 ff., esp. 109–114; *Fortnightly Review* 1877, i. 694 ff.

† Including *Arabia*: see Strabo, p. 783; Bokhari, iii. 206 (W. R. Smith, *Kinship*, 122–135; Wellh. in "Die Ehe bei den Arabern," in the Gött. *Nachrichten*, 1893, p. 460 ff.).

‡ H. Spencer, *Fortnightly Review, ib.* p. 895 ff.; Westermarck, *Human Marriage*, pp. 3, 510–515; Wake, *Marriage and Kinship*, ch. v., esp. pp. 172–178; A. H. Post, *Entwicklungsgesch. des Familienrechts*, pp. 58 f., 63; Starcke, *The Primitive Family*, pp. 128–170. (The reader should be aware that the term "Levirate-marriage" is used by different writers in different senses: by some it is used in the broader sense noticed above (p. 281), by others it is limited to the special type, such as prevailed among the Hebrews and the Hindus.)

§ Post, *Ethnol. Jurisprudenz*, p. 40 ff.; Starcke, pp. 141, 152 f., 159 f., 165–167.

Digitized by Google

interests and rights. As remarked above, the Levirate-marriage prevails with many modifications of detail: frequently, for example, it is limited to the case where the surviving brother is younger than the deceased brother;* as the strong sense of family unity which gave it rise becomes weakened, the brother, though he must still make provision for the widow, often retains only the right, and not the duty, to take her in marriage;† elsewhere it is permitted only where the education of the deceased brother's children has to be provided for.‡ Not improbably the Hebrew institution was once considerably wider in its operation than appears in the OT.: there, very nearly as among the Hindus and the Malagasy, it is confined to the particular case in which the widow has no sons, and in which therefore some special provision is necessary to secure the perpetuation of the deceased man's family, and maintain the integrity of his estate. That the issue of the marriage is counted as belonging to another than his real father is due to the operation of a "legal fiction," of which numerous examples are to be found in ancient law.

The marriage of Bo'az and Ruth (in spite of Nowack, *Arch.* i. 346 f.) is not a Levirate-marriage: Bo'az is not Ruth's brother-in-law; but he "purchases" her (4^{10}), together with No'omi's estate (4^{3}), which he "redeems": he takes her consequently not as *Levir*, but as *Go'el*; and this office devolves upon him, as 1^{11b} hints, just because No'omi has no surviving son, able to discharge the duty of Levir. The resemblances to Dt. 25 in Ru. 4 are due to the *general* community of subject-matter (the elders intervening in a case of family law, the "gate," &c.), not to the fact that the same case is being described. From a legal point of view, the marriage of Bo'az and Ruth, and the perpetuation of Maḥlon's name ($4^{5b. 10}$), are elements in the transaction, subordinate to the question of the redemption of Elimelech's estate (4^{1-4}).

In Lev. 18^{16} 20^{21} marriage with a brother's wife (widow) is forbidden. The two laws are usually harmonised by the supposition that Lev. prescribes the general rule, which is superseded in the law of Dt. by the exceptional circumstances there contemplated. As the conditions under which the marriage is permitted are very precisely described in Dt., this explanation may be the correct one. (The difference is otherwise explained by Benzinger, *Arch.* p. 346; Nowack, *Arch.* i. 346.)

11–12. Against immodesty in women.—*When men strive with one another* (כי ינצו אנשים)] as Ex. 21^{22}.—**12.** *Thine eye shall not spare*] 7^{16}.—"The case, significant for the manners of the age, was, nevertheless, assuredly not of such frequent occurrence as to call for prohibition by a special enactment: it is, however, selected typically (as *e.g.* 19^{5}) out of a number of others, in order to serve as a standard for the judgment to be pronounced in similar cases. Immodesty, even when extenuating circumstances are present, is to be checked as stringently as possible. It is, moreover, apart from the *jus*

* Post, p. 45 f. † *Ib.* p. 42. ‡ *Ib.* p. 46.

Digitized by Google

talionis [see on 19^{21}], the only case in which the law prescribes the mutilation of the person as a punishment" (Dillm.).

13–16. On honesty in trade.—The Israelite is not to have in his possession unjust weights or measures; for Jehovah abhors dishonesty, whereas His blessing rests upon those who deal uprightly. Justice in the administration of judgment has been insisted on previously (16^{18-20}): here justice in commercial transactions is insisted on likewise. Lev. 19^{35-36}, in the Law of Holiness, is parallel: "Ye shall do no unrighteousness (עול) in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in measure. Just balances, just stones, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have: I am Jehovah your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt."—**13.** *Thou shalt not have in thy bag* (Mic. 6^{11} Pr. 16^{11}) *two different* (*stones*)] lit. *a stone and a stone*, *i.e.* stones of different size and weight, or (as the following words explain), "a great and a small,"—the larger one for buying, and the smaller for selling; Am. 8^{5} shows how this type of dishonesty prevailed in N. Israel. *Stones* were frequently used for weights in ancient countries. For the Heb. idiom employed, comp. Pr. 20^{23} (the same expression), Ps. 12^{3} (lit. "with a heart and a heart") 1 Ch. 12^{33}.—**14.** *Two different ephahs*] the most ordinary, and standard, Heb. measure is taken as the example; comp. Lev. 19^{36} Am. 8^{5} Mic. 6^{10} Ez. 45^{10}.—**15.** *A whole and just stone*] "whole," *i.e.* not deficient in any respect, not under weight. Comp. Pr. 11^{1} (מאזני מרמה תועבת יהוה ואבן שלמה רצונו).—*That thy days may be long, &c.*] 5^{16} (Ex. 20^{12}); cf. 4^{40}: see on 4^{26} 1^{20}.—**16.** *For every one that doeth these things, &c.*] the ground, exactly as 18^{12} 22^{5}: see also 7^{25} ("abomination").—(Even) *every one that doeth unrighteousness* (עָוֶל)] עשה עול, as Lev. $19^{15.35}$ (H), quoted above, and in Ez. (3^{20} $18^{24.26}$ $33^{13.15.18}$). עול is not a common word, occurring, beyond the passages quoted, only 9 times.

17–19. The 'Amaleḳites to be exterminated by Israel.—The hostility displayed by 'Amaleḳ towards Israel as they came out of Egypt (Ex. 17^{8-13}), when they pursued them with such pertinacity as even to cut off stragglers in their rear, is not to be forgotten by Israel: when settled securely in their

13. אבן ואבן] *Lex.* ן 1 i.—**15.** וצרק] cf. G-K. § 131. 2^{b}.

Digitized by Google

land, they are to remember Jehovah's purpose, then solemnly pronounced against His people's foe (Ex. $17^{14.16}$). The verses repeat and enforce, in the style and manner of Dt., the duty thus laid (implicitly) upon Israel. The repetition is agreeable to the situation in which the discourses of Dt. are represented as having been delivered. The passage of Ex. declaring Jehovah's purpose to "blot out the remembrance of 'Amaleḳ from under heaven" is a striking and emphatic one; and in a recapitulation of the principles designed for Israel's future guidance, supposed to have been addressed to them when they were on the point of entering the Promised Land, it is not more than natural that it should have been repeated. The fact that 'Amaleḳ, at the time when Dt. was written, had ceased to be a neighbour formidable to Israel, even if it had not ceased to exist as a nation altogether (cf. 1 S. 15; 30^{17}; 1 Ch. 4^{43}), does not affect the question: the injunction is supposed to have been given at a time when its execution was yet future; and in so far as it had been actually carried into effect, the Israelitish reader would have the satisfaction of feeling that it was a point on which his nation had not failed in responding to the duty laid upon it.—**17.** *Remember what 'Amaleḳ, &c.*] the sentence is framed exactly as 24^{9}.—*In the way, &c.*] as $23^{5\,(4)}$.—*How he met thee* (קָרְךָ) *by the way*] cf. 1 S. 15^{2} (את אשר עשה עמלק לישראל אשר שׂם לו בדרך).—**18.** *And cut off at the rear in thee all that were fagged behind thee*] lit. "*tailed* in thee," *i.e.* cut off as a tail those whom sickness or exhaustion compelled to follow on slowly behind. Cf. Jos. 10^{19} (D^2)†. This particular incident is not mentioned in Ex. 17^{8-13}.—*Fagged*] see below.—*Faint and weary*] Jud. $8^{5.15}$ (עָיֵף); 2 S. 17^{2} (יָגֵעַ), cf. v.[29]. Advantage was taken of a time when Israel was exhausted by the heat, or other accident of the journey.—*And he feared not God*] "according to the rules of ancient Arabian hospitality, and with some sense of God, such as may be presupposed even among the heathen (Gn. 20^{3-8} 42^{18}), the 'Amaleḳites ought to have spared, and indeed

18. וזנב] the *Piel privat.*, as 24^{20}.—נחשלים] of uncertain meaning. In Dan. 2^{40} the Aram. חשל is to *beat down, subdue*: in Syr. חשל is *to forge* a metal; hence perhaps *beaten down* (by heat or fatigue), *over-done, fagged.*

Digitized by Google

rather assisted, those who lagged behind, unfit for battle. That they did the contrary, was inhuman and barbarous: a people with such evil customs deserves no mercy" (Dillm.).—**19.** *Giveth thee rest, &c.*] so 12^{10}. The period meant is that of the Kings (cf. 2 S. 7^{1}).—*In the land which, &c.*] exactly as 15^{4}.—*Thou shalt blot out, &c.*] Ex. 17^{14} "I will utterly blot out the remembrance of ʽAmalek from under heaven." The Divine purpose, declared in these words, is here impressed upon Israel as a duty.—*Thou shalt not forget*] cf. 9^{7}.

XXVI. *Two liturgical ceremonies to be performed periodically by the Israelite in Canaan; with an exhortation impressing once again upon Israel its obligations towards Jehovah.*

The subject of this chapter fits it to form a suitable close to the code of laws constituting the Deuteronomic legislation (c. 5–11; 12–25). It provides the Israelite with the means of periodically reminding himself, before God, of the obligations under which he lives, and of the spirit of grateful and ready acquiescence in which he should yield obedience to them.

1–11. A form of thanksgiving, to be used annually by the Israelite, at the time of presenting his first-fruits at the Central Sanctuary.—The Israelite, bringing with him his first-fruits in a basket (which the priest will receive from his hands and present formally at the altar), is to make a solemn confession of Jehovah's bounty and faithfulness as manifested in His dealings with his nation, and in grateful acknowledgment of His goodness to offer to Him the first-fruits of the soil which He has given him to possess.—**1.** *When thou art come, &c.*] nearly as 17^{14}.—*For an inheritance*] 4^{21} &c.—**2.** *Some of the first* (18^{4}) *of all the fruit*] whether the "some of" is to be taken strictly, or not (cf. v.[10]), is uncertain; comp. on v.[11].—*Unto the place, &c.*] $12^{5.\,11}$.—**3.** *The priest that shall be in those days*] *i.e.* the priest for the time being (17^{9} 19^{17}). By the sing. is meant, probably, the chief priest (acting, if necessary, through one of his deputies).—**3.** *I declare this day, &c.*] the Israelite confesses that he owes his present enjoy-

Digitized by Google

ment of the land to Jehovah's faithfulness.—*Sware*] 1^{8}.—**5–9.** How Jehovah had wonderfully multiplied the nation, and brought it from servitude in Egypt into fertile Canaan. The passage consists largely of reminiscences of JE's narrative in Ex., with one or two from Nu. 20.—**5.** *An Aramæan ready to perish* (אֹבֵד) *was my father*] Jacob is so styled, with intentional disparagement, on account of his foreign connexions; his mother's home had been in Aram-Naharaim (Gn. $24^{10.\,24}$), and he spent himself many years in the same country (Gn. 29–31) in the service of his mother's brother, Laban "the Aramæan" (Gn. 25^{20} 28^{5} in P; $31^{20.\,24}$ in JE), whose two daughters he married. אֹבֵד, prop. *perishing* (Job 29^{13} Pr. 31^{6}), when applied to animals, esp. sheep, suggests the idea of *lost* (and so in danger of perishing) *by straying* (Jer. 50^{6} Ez. $34^{4.\,16}$ Ps. 119^{176}; comp. 1 S. $9^{3.\,20}$); and as such an idea would be applicable to Jacob, with his many wanderings, it is not improbable that it may have been felt to be associated with the word here; hence RV. *marg.* "Or, *wandering*; Or, *lost*": cf. Is. 27^{13}. But the once destitute foreigner, slender as his chances of life might have appeared to be, became ultimately a great people.—*To sojourn there*] Gn. 47^{4}.—*Few in number*] cf. Gn. 34^{30}.—*Great, mighty, and populous*] Ex. 1^{9}; cf. c. 1^{10}.—**6.** *Evil entreated us* (וירעו אתנו)] Nu. 20^{15} (JE).—*Afflicted us* (ויענונו)] Ex. 1^{12}.—*Hard bondage* (עבדה קשה)] Ex. 1^{14} 6^{9} (both P); also 1 K. 12^{4} Is. 14^{3}.—**7.** *Cried unto Jehovah*] Nu. 20^{16}; cf. Ex. 3^{7}.—*The God of our fathers*] Ex. $3^{15.\,16}$.—*Heard our voice*] Nu. 20^{16}.—*Saw our affliction*] Ex. 3^{9} 4^{31}.—*And our oppression* (לחצנו)] Ex. 3^{9}.—**8.** *Brought us forth, &c.*] the expressions as above, 8^{14} 4^{34}.—**9.** *Unto this place*] 1^{31} 9^{7} 11^{5}.—*Flowing with milk and honey*] 6^{3} &c.—**10.** *So shalt thou set it down . . . and worship*] viz. with the ceremonial just described (v.$^{4\text{-}10a}$). In point of fact it is the priest who is actually to "set down" the basket (v.^{4}).—**11.** *And thou shalt rejoice because of all the good, &c.*] comp. $12^{6f.\,11f.\,17f.}$ $16^{11.\,14}$, which make it evident that what is meant is the joy of a sacred meal, held at the sanctuary, in which the needy Levite and the stranger (as in the passages quoted) are to be invited to share.

XXVI. 5. בִּמְתֵי מְעָט] so 28^{62}: the ב as 10^{22}.

Digitized by Google

In 18^{4} the *rēshith* forms part of the revenue of the priests. The present passage is not necessarily in conflict with that, though the exact manner in which the first-fruits were disposed of is not certain. In may be naturally supposed that the first-fruits presented at the altar became afterwards the property of the priests: in this case, as it is not distinctly said that the sacred meal of v.^{11} consisted of the first-fruits, the reference may be to the sacred meal accompanying one of the three annual Pilgrimages, perhaps that of Weeks (16^{11}), at which the first-fruits may have been offered. Or if the part. מִן (*some of* the first-fruits) in v.^{2} is to be taken strictly, as the amount of the first-fruits is not defined in 18^{4}, it may have been considered sufficient to hand over a part to the priest (v.$^{2.4.10}$), the remainder being consumed at a sacred meal. The former alternative seems preferable.

12–15. A solemn profession of obedience in the past, with a prayer for a blessing in the future, to be made by the Israelite after he has completed his payment of the triennial tithe.—The tithe of the third year was appropriated to charitable purposes in the Israelite's native place ($14^{28f.}$): this not being in itself a religious act, a substitute is provided, consisting in a form of words, expressing the worshipper's sense of the obedience which he owes to God, and of His dependence upon Him for future blessing.—**12.** *In the third year, the year of tithing*] see on 14^{28}.—*And givest it to the Levite, &c.*] as prescribed in $14^{28f.}$.—**13.** *Before Jehovah thy God*] possibly, as Gn. 27^{7}, in the Israelite's own home, "before God the all-present" (Knob., Keil); but, more probably (Riehm, *HWB.* 1794^{b}, Di.), in view of the general usage of D, "before Jehovah at the central sanctuary" (v.$^{5.10}$ $12^{7.12.18}$ $14^{23.26}$ 15^{20} 16^{11} 19^{17}),—probably, on the occasion of the pilgrimage thither at the end of the year, at the Feast of Booths.—*I have exterminated* ($13^{7\,(6)}$) *that which is holy out of my house*] "Holy" (cf. on 12^{26}) refers to the tithe, which, being consecrated to Jehovah, so long as it remains in a private house, is of the nature of an unpaid debt, a due wrongfully withheld; hence the strong verb employed, signifying its *total* removal from the house.—*Have given them, &c.*] 14^{29}.—*I have not*

12. לַעְשֵׂר] for לְהַעְשִׂיר (cf. Neh. 10^{39} בַּעְשֵׂר): G-K. § 53. 3 R.$^{2.7}$. But the Hif. does not occur elsewhere; and prob. לְעַשֵּׂר should be read, as 14^{22} Gn. 28^{22}.—שנת המעשר] 𝔊 τὸ δεύτερον ἐπιδέκατον, introducing the idea of the "second tithe" (above, p. 170). But this could be only המעשר השני, of which שנת המעשר is not a probable corruption. The rendering possesses no exegetical or critical value; and implies merely that שנת was read (ungrammatically) as שֵׁנִית.

transgressed any of thy commandments] the context (on both sides) shows that the reference is to the particular commandments relating to the tithe: the worshipper affirms that he has paid it in full to those who were authorized to receive it: the words are thus not conceived in a spirit of self-righteousness; for they relate only to a particular and limited duty, which it would require no severe moral effort to perform.—**14.** He has, moreover, while it was in his custody, guarded it carefully against defilement.—*I have not eaten thereof in my sorrow*] *i.e.* in my mourning; אָוֶן as Hos. 9^{4}. Contact with a corpse, or even proximity to it in the same house, occasioned ceremonial uncleanness (Nu. $19^{11.14}$, in P); if a man, therefore, whilst he was unclean from this cause, partook of the tithe, the whole would become unclean in consequence. "Bread of sorrows" is alluded to as unclean in Hos. 9^{4}.—*Nor exterminated thereof whilst unclean*] he has been careful, while removing (v.^{13}) the tithe from his house, to be in other respects, also, ceremonially clean. Contact with holy things, whilst a person was unclean, whether through proximity to a corpse, or from any other cause, had to be avoided: comp. (of the priests) Lev. 22^{3-6} (H) Nu. $18^{11.13}$ (P).—*Nor given thereof for* (or *to*) *the dead*] the exact sense of these words is uncertain, the Hebrew being ambiguous. If the rendering *for the dead* (14^{1}) be correct, the allusion will be to the custom of the friends of a deceased person testifying their sympathy with the mourners assembled in the house by sending to them gifts of bread or other food, for their refreshment (2 S. 3^{35} Jer. 16^{7} Ez. 24^{17}): food consumed at such funeral feasts being naturally (see above) "unclean," it would be deemed unlawful to apply any part of the tithe to such a purpose (so Kn., Ke., Ew. *Antiq.* p. 204, Oettli). If, on the other hand, the rendering *to the dead* be correct, then the allusion will be, most probably, to the practice which was widely prevalent among ancient nations (Tylor, *Primitive Culture*,[3] i. 490 ff., ii. 30–43, including survivals among Christian peoples), and was in vogue also among the later Jews (Tob. 4^{18}: comp. Sir. $30^{18f.}$, where the practice is ridiculed), of placing food in the grave with the dead, for

14. בטמא] "*as* one unclean" (on v.^{5}): cf. בחזק יבוא Is. 40^{10}.

Digitized by Google

the use of the departed spirit on its journey to the Underworld. The practice referred to was common in Egypt, where "small tables were sometimes placed in the tombs, bearing offerings of cakes, ducks, or other things, according to the wealth or inclination of the donors" (Wilkinson-Birch, *Anc. Egypt.* ed. 1878, iii. 432, where there is a representation of such a table found at Thebes, now in the British Museum). So Dillm., Oort (*Th. Tijdschr.* 1877, p. 354 f.), Wellh. (*Arab. Heid.* 162). Such a custom, though not otherwise attested in the OT., might well have prevailed among the more superstitious Israelites, for whom such prohibitions as those in $18^{10f.}$ were necessary.

According to others, the allusion is to actual *sacrifices*, offered to the dead for the purpose of rendering them propitious to the survivors: so Halévy, *Mélanges de Crit.* 1883, p. 371; Stade, *Gesch.* i. 389, 425; Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode*, 1892, pp. 22, 25; Benzinger, *Arch.* 165, 166 f.; Nowack, *Arch.* i. 196 f., ii. 300: cf. Spencer, *Legg. Heb.* II. xxiv. § 3. 3 (of offerings to deities such as Osiris or Adonis). This is possible: but it is not required by the text of the passage; and, in spite of Schwally and Nowack, it is far from established as a Hebrew custom by Jer. 16^7.

I have hearkened, &c.] a renewed profession of the conscientious completeness with which this religious duty has been discharged.—**15.** As the worshipper can thus conscientiously say that he has rendered to Jehovah the due which He claims of the produce of the soil, so he closes with the prayer that Jehovah, on His part, will still vouchsafe to bless His land, and the people dwelling upon it.—*Look forth* (השקיפה)] Ps. 14^2 102^{20}.—*Thy holy habitation* (מעון קדשך)] Jer. 25^{30} Zc. 2^{17} Ps. 68^6 2 Ch. 30^{27}†: מעון, in classical Heb., is confined to poetry, and the elevated prose of the prophets. Cf. Is. 63^{15}.—*And the ground, &c.*] cf. $11^{12.14f.}$.—*As thou swarest*] 1^8.—*A land flowing, &c.*] v.[9].

16–19. Closing exhortation, reminding Israel of the mutual obligations, undertaken by Jehovah and the people respectively, in the covenant subsisting between them.—*This day*] 4^8 5^1 &c. —*These statutes and judgments*] *i.e.* those contained in c. 12–25; comp. 12^1.—*Observe and do them*] 4^6.—*With all thine heart and with all thy soul*] on 6^5.—**17.** *Thou hast this day*

17. האמיר] so v.[18]†. The rend. adopted above is that of Ges., Ew. (*Ant.* p. 28), Kn., Keil, and is the most satisfactory, others that have been proposed being questionable philologically.

Digitized by Google

caused Jehovah to say (האמרת) *that he will be thy God, &c.*] הֶאֱמִיר (which occurs only here and v.[18]) was perhaps a term used technically by the contracting parties in a covenant, each causing the other to recite the terms of the agreement between them. So here Israel, by listening so readily to the commandments set before it, has (virtually) "caused Jehovah to say" that He will be its God, and that it should observe His commandments; and Jehovah has at the same time "caused Israel to say" that it will be His people and keep His commandments, and that He will then respond, on His part, by promoting it above the nations of the earth. That Israel "*caused*, or *occasioned*, Jehovah to say," is not, of course, literally exact; but the expression follows from the nature of the case, and is a consequence of Jehovah's having condescended to become one of the contracting parties to a covenant.—*To be to thee for a God* (להיות לך לאלהים)] a common phrase (with *thee*, *you*, *them*, &c., as the case may be): 29^{12}; 2 S. 7^{24} (= 1 Ch. 17^{22}) Jer. 7^{23} 11^{4} 24^{7} 30^{22} 31^{33} (cf. v.[1]) Ez. 11^{20} 14^{11} 34^{24} 36^{28} $37^{23.27}$ Zech. 8^{8}; in P (incl. H), Gn. $17^{7.8}$ Ex. 6^{7} 29^{45} Lev. 11^{45} 22^{33} 25^{38} $26^{12.45}$ Nu. 15^{41}† (differently Gn. 28^{21} (JE); Ex. 4^{16}).—*To walk in his ways, &c.*] the expressions, as 8^{6} $4^{30.40}$ &c.—**18.** *And Jehovah hath this day caused thee to say* (v.[17]) *that thou wilt be to him a peculiar people*] 7^{6} (with note), based on Ex. 19^{5} (והייתם לי סגלה), the passage here referred to ("as he said unto thee"). The phrase is an expansion of the common one "to be to him (*or* me) for a people," the correlative of "to be to thee for a God," and often found in combination with it; 27^{9} (נהיית) Jer. 7^{23} 11^{4} 13^{11} 24^{7} 30^{22} 31^{33} (cf. v.[1]) 32^{38} Ez. 11^{20} 14^{11} 36^{28} $37^{23.27}$ Zech. 2^{15} 8^{8}, in H, Lev. 26^{12}; with other verbs, Dt. 29^{12} (הקים), 1 S. 12^{22} (עשה) 2 S. 7^{23} (פדה) [24] (כונן; in the ||, 1 Ch. 17^{22} נתן), in P, Ex. 6^{7} (לקח)†: and the undertaking being given by a human subject, as here, 2 K. 11^{17} = 2 Ch. 23^{16}.—*And keep all his commandments*] explanatory of the conditions involved in Israel's agreeing to be Jehovah's עם סגלה.—**19.** *And that he will set thee high, &c.*] 28^{1b}; cf., of the Israelitish king, Ps. $89^{28\,(27)}$.—*Which he hath made*] Ps. 86^{9}.—*For a praise, and for a name, and for an honour* (lit. *an ornament*)] *i.e.* to be an

Digitized by Google

object of pride and renown unto Jehovah; so Jer. 13^{11b} (the same words), cf. 33^{9} Zeph. $3^{19.20}$.—*An holy people, &c.*] 7^{6} $14^{2.21}$ 28^{9}; varied from Ex. 19^{6} (גוי קדוש), which is referred to here ("as he hath spoken"), as v.[5] is referred to in the last verse. From its position, the condition of being a holy people to Jehovah appears to be viewed here as a privilege conferred upon Israel by God (cf. 28^{9}), rather than as a duty (which it is Israel's part to realise for itself ($14^{2.21}$). Naturally, consecration to Jehovah has this double aspect, either side of which may be brought into prominence, according to the truth which a writer on a particular occasion desires to enforce.

XXVII. *Instructions relative to a symbolical acceptance by the nation of the Deuteronomic Code, after its entrance into Canaan.*

In this chapter the discourse of Moses is interrupted, and the writer uses the third person (as 1^{1-5} 4^{41-43} 5^{1} $29^{1\,(2)ff.}$). It contains injunctions relative to *four* ceremonies: (1) the inscription of the Deuteronomic law on stones upon Mount ʻEbal, v.[1-4. 8]; (2) the erection of an altar and offering of sacrifices on the same spot, v.[5-7]; (3) the ratification of the new covenant by the people standing on *both* mountains, six tribes upon each, v.[11-13]; (4) the twelve curses to be uttered by the Levites, and responded to by the whole people, v.[14-26]. V.[9-10] consists of a practical exhortation addressed to Israel.

The chapter presents considerable critical difficulties. Not only are the various parts of which it consists imperfectly connected with each other (see the notes), but it stands in a most unsuitable place. C. 28 forms manifestly the proper close of the Deut. Code (c. 5–26), and connects well with 26^{19}; but c. 27 lacks connexion both with c. 26 and with c. 28 (the transition from 27^{14-26} to 28^{1} being peculiarly abrupt), while at the same time it interrupts the discourse of Moses with directions, the proper place of which is after c. 28, and with a series of imprecations (v.[14-26]) which (where they now stand) anticipate unduly $28^{15ff.}$. It is hardly possible that the chapter can form part of the original Dt. It seems that a Deutero-

Digitized by Google

nomic nucleus has been expanded by the addition of later elements, and placed here, in an unsuitable context, by a later hand.

1–8. **The Israelites, on the day that they cross Jordan, are to take great stones, to inscribe upon them the Deuteronomic law, and to set them up upon Mount 'Ebal, at the same time erecting an altar, and offering sacrifices, to Jehovah.**—The ceremony, here prescribed, is intended evidently as a public and official acceptance by the nation of the Deuteronomic Code, ratified by religious sanctions.

The passage appears to be composite. V.$^{1-4}$ and v.^{8} belong closely together (all relating to the *stones*, and to what is to be written upon them); but they are interrupted by v.$^{5-7}$ (relating entirely to the *altar*). V$^{1-4.\,8}$ (as also v.^{7b}) abound with marks of the Deut. style, which are absent from v.$^{5-7a}$. It seems that an older injunction (JE), v.$^{5-7a}$, respecting a sacrifice on 'Ebal, has been taken up by D (or a follower of D), supplemented by the addition of v.^{7b}, and combined with the instructions, written in his own words, for the inscription on stones of the Deut. law. It is a further question whether v.$^{1-4.\,8}$ itself is the work of one hand or two. Dillm. points out that v.$^{2-3a}$ are repeated, largely in the same words, in v.$^{4.\,8}$, with the difference that while in v.^{4} 'Ebal is specified as the place where the stones are to be set up, in v.$^{2-3}$ they are to be set up *immediately* after the passage of Jordan (note not only v.^{2} "on the day," but v.^{3} "that thou mayest *go in*," &c.): hence he assigns v.$^{1-3}$ to D, v.$^{4.\,7b.\,8}$ to R^{d}. But the repetition may be due to the diffuse character of the Deut. style (Kuen. *Th. T.* xii. 299), and the other difference may arise from the fact that the writer, looking back to a distant past, may not have reflected on the time that must actually have elapsed between the passage of Jordan and the arrival at 'Ebal. In 11^{30} 'Ebal seems to be represented as nearer to Jordan than it actually is.

1. *And the elders*] elsewhere in Dt. Moses is represented as alone laying commands upon Israel. Why the elders (31^{9}) are here exceptionally associated with him, it seems impossible satisfactorily to explain; the sing. ויצו, and the pron. "I," show that in any case they are assigned only a subordinate position beside him.—*All the commandment, &c.*] *i.e.* the Deut. law; cf. on 8^{1}.—**2.** *On the day when, &c.*] hardly = "in the time when"; for (1) בַּיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר is not quite the same as בְּיוֹם (sq. inf. or pf.), Gn. 2^{4} Nu. 3^{1}, and where it occurs besides (2 S. 19^{20} Est. 9^{1}) denotes a literal "day"; and (2) in v.^{3b} only the passage of Jordan is contemplated, the occupation of

XXVII. 1. שָׁמֹר] 5^{12} 16^{1}; cf. on 1^{16}.—**2.** שִׂיד] v.^{4} Am. 2^{1} Is. 33^{12}†.

Digitized by Google

Canaan being yet in the future. If v.[4] (ʽEbal) is by the same hand as v.[1-3], the difference, it seems, can only be explained as suggested above.—*Great stones*] because much was to be inscribed upon them.—*Plaister them with plaister*] *i.e.* coat them with lime or gypsum (שִׂיד), in order to secure a surface on which the writing inscribed might be clearly legible. The letters were not to be carved in the stone (as is usually the case in ancient inscriptions), but to be inscribed, with some suitable pigment, upon a prepared surface. The practice was Egyptian. In Egypt it was the custom to put a layer of stucco, or paint, over the stone used in architecture, of whatever quality, even granite: and in the case of sandstone, which was porous, a coat of calcareous composition was laid on before the paint was applied. The black pigment, used in Egypt, consisted of ivory or bone black; and figures, or characters, inscribed by this method were very permanent (Wilkinson-Birch, *Anc. Eg.* ii. 286–288). It was a common custom in antiquity to engrave laws upon slabs of stone or metal, and to set them up in some public place. At Carthage the regulations respecting sacrifices were thus engraved (*CIS.* I. i. 166–170). In Greece such slabs were called στῆλαι (*e.g.* Plato, *Crit.* 119 C, E; Demosth. *Lept.* p. 495): many laws and decrees of Athens, and other Greek states, so inscribed, have been discovered during recent years (see *e.g.* Hicks, *Greek Hist. Inscriptions*, 1882, *passim*).—**3.** *All the words of this law*] *i.e.* of the Deuteronomic Code (c. 5–26), according to the general usage of the expression "this law" (1[5]). Others have supposed the reference to be to the blessings and curses (Jos. *Ant.* iv. 8. 44, who says, inexactly, that they were inscribed on the *altar*), or to the 613 precepts which the Jews computed to be contained in the Pent. (*Soṭah*, vii. 5; Knob., Ke.); but neither of these explanations is consistent with the term used. Whether the whole of c. 5–26 is intended, or the laws alone (without the hortatory introductions and comments), must remain undetermined. This inscription of the Deut. Code is intended as a declaration, on the part of the people, made as soon after their entry into Canaan as possible, that it is the rule under which in future they elect to live, while the

Digitized by Google

laws inscribed upon the slabs remain as a permanent record of the fact (cf. Is. 8^{1} 30^{8}).—*In order that thou mayest go in, &c.*] the phrases as 4^{40} 6^{3}. The words seem clearly to contemplate the occupation of Canaan as still future; see on v.[2].—**4.** *'Ebal*] Sam. has "Gerizim," the sacred mountain of the Samaritans. No doubt, an arbitrary alteration of the text: see Ges. *de Pent. Sam.* p. 61; De Rossi, *Var. Lect. ad loc.*—**5–7.** The *altar* to be erected on the same spot. It is to be built, according to the ancient law of Ex. 20^{25} (JE), in simple fashion, of *whole, i.e.* of unhewn stones, upon which no tool has been used. Burnt-offerings are to be offered upon it, and also peace-offerings (cf. Ex. 20^{24}), the latter accompanied by the usual sacrificial meal. The nation's public acceptance of the Deut. law in Canaan is to be marked by religious ceremonies, similar to those by which the covenant of Sinai was concluded (Ex. $24^{5.\,11}$). The representation cannot be destitute of an historical basis: no doubt at the time when E wrote, there was such an altar on 'Ebal, together with slabs of stone inscribed with parts of the law, which tradition told had been set up there shortly after Israel's entrance into Canaan. Comp. Jos. 8^{31}. Burnt- and peace-offerings are often mentioned together in the historical books, as Ex. 24^{5} Jud. 20^{26} 21^{5} 1 S. 10^{8} 2 S. 6^{17} 1 K. 3^{15}.—**7.** *Peace-offerings* (שְׁלָמִים)] elsewhere in Dt. (on 12^{6} 18^{3}) these are denoted by the term "sacrifices" (זְבָחִים); see $12^{6.\,11.\,27}$ 18^{3}.—*Eat*] on 12^{7}.—*And thou shalt rejoice before Jehovah*] as 12^{12}. This clause, if the view adopted above be correct, will be an addition made by D (or R^{d}) to the passage (v.[5-7a]) taken by him from E.—**8.** *Upon the stones*] *i.e.* those named in v.[2.4] (see v.[3a]), not those mentioned in v.[5].

9–10. Israel is reminded of the obligations involved in its character as Jehovah's people.—The verses have been often supposed (Ewald, *Hist.* i. 121; Kleinert, p. 183; Kuen. *Th. T.* 1878, p. 302 f., *Hex.* § 7. 21; Dillm.; Westphal, p. 99), not without reason, to have been the link which originally con-

5. תניף] as 23^{26} Ex. 20^{25}; cf. Is. 10^{15}. In Arab. *to raise aloft*; in Heb., coupled with the idea of moving to and fro, *to swing* or *wave* (the hand, &c.).—**6.** אבנים שלמות וגו'] in appos. with את מזבח י': Engl. idiom inserts "of." So Gn. 2^{7} Ex. 20^{25} 25^{18} &c. (Dr. § 195. 1; G-K. § 117. 5 *b* δ).—**8.** באר] Hab. 2^{2}; cf. 1^{5}.—באר היטב] the double *inf. abs.*, as 9^{21}.

Digitized by Google

nected c. 26 with c. 28. On the one hand, they are unconnected either with v.$^{1-8}$ or with v.$^{11-26}$ (for not only does a new introduction follow in v.^{11}, but the expression "commandments and statutes," which elsewhere denotes the Deut. Code as a whole, is too general to be understood of the imprecations v.$^{14-26}$); on the other hand, they are kindred in thought with 26^{17-19} (cf. v.^{9} *this day* with *this day* 26^{17}; and the similar argument based in both passages on the fact of Israel being Jehovah's people); and, while 27^{14-26} is followed very abruptly by c. 28, 29^{9-10} would be a suitable and natural introduction to it.—**9.** *The priests the Levites*]; see on 18^{1}.—*All Israel*] 1^{1}.—*Hear, O Israel*] 5^{1}.—*This day thou art become a people unto, &c.*] 26^{18}.—**10.** *Hearken, then, unto the voice, &c.*] cf. 26^{17}.—*Commandments and statutes*] 4^{40} 6^{2} 10^{13} 28^{45} 30^{10}, cf. 26^{17}.—*Which I am commanding thee this day*] 4^{40} and repeatedly.

11–13. The Deuteronomic Code to be ratified, and symbolically accepted, by Israel at a national solemnity to be celebrated on Mount Gerizim and Mount ʿEbal.—The verses have reference to 11^{26-30}, where a blessing is promised, in case Israel obeys Jehovah's commandments, and a curse in case it departs from them; and the blessing, it is then said, is to be "set" upon Mount Gerizim, and the curse upon Mount ʿEbal. The last words point evidently to some kind of symbolical ceremony; and the present passage indicates what the nature of the ceremony intended is: six of the tribes are to stand upon one of the two mountains named, invoking a blessing upon the people, in the event of their obedience, and six upon the other, invoking similarly a curse, in the event of their disobedience. The sons of Jacob's legitimate wives, Leah and Rachel, are, it may be observed, chosen for the blessing, the sons of his two concubines, Zilpah and Bilhah (Gad and Asher, and Dan and Naphtali), for the curse, the numbers on the two sides being equalized by Reuben, who forfeited his birthright (Gn. 49^{4}), and Zebulun, as the youngest son of Leah (Gn. $30^{19f.}$), being transferred from the former division to the latter

9. הַסְכֵּת] only here. *Sakata* in Arab. is *to be silent* (*e.g.* Gn. 15^{12} Ex. 15^{16} Saad.).—נהיית] the Nif. is elsewhere hardly used, except of an occurrence, to be *brought about*: cf. 4^{32}.—**13.** על] nearly=*for* (rare): cf. Ex. 12^{4} 29^{36} Ps. 89^{48} (*Lex.* על **1 g** δ).

Digitized by Google

(Knob., Keil., Dillm.). On the two mountains selected, see on 11^{29}. For the manner in which the instructions here given are stated to have been carried out, see Jos. 8^{33} (D^2).

14–26. A series of twelve imprecations, to be pronounced by the Levites, and responded to by the people, declaring God's curse against twelve typical forms of sin.—Of the offences against which these curses are directed, all are reprobated elsewhere in the Pent., though not all in one and the same Code; thus seven are forbidden, or (the twelfth) deprecated, in other parts of Dt., six in the laws of JE (Ex. 20. 21–23. 34), nine in Lev. 17–26 (H).

The following table exhibits the parallels in a synoptical form:—

Ex.	Deut. 27.	Lev. 17-26.
$20^{4.23}$ 34^{17}	v.^{15} (the secret worship of an image): cf. $4^{16.23.25}$	19^{4} 26^{1a}
20^{12} 21^{17}	v.^{16} (dishonour of parents): 5^{16}, cf. 21^{18-21}	20^{9}
	v.^{17} (removal of landmark): 19^{14}	
	v.^{18} (misleading the blind)	19^{14}
22^{21-24} 23^{9}	v.^{19} (wresting the judgment of the stranger, fatherless, and widow): 24^{17}	$19^{33f.}$
	v.^{20} (incest with step-mother): 23^{1} (22^{30})	18^{8} 20^{11}
$22^{18 (19)}$	v.^{21} (bestiality)	18^{23} 20^{15}
	v.^{22} (incest with half-sister)	18^{9} 20^{17}
	v.^{23} (incest with mother-in-law)	18^{17} 20^{14}
20^{13} 21^{12}	v.^{24} (murder)	24^{17}
cf. 23^{8}	v.^{25} (receiving bribes for slaying the innocent): cf. 16^{19}	
* * *	v.^{26} (disregard of the Deuteronomic law)	* * *

The parallels agree in substance, but the resemblance is seldom verbal: hence the imprecations will hardly have been taken directly from the corresponding prohibitions. The offences against which they are directed are the dishonour of Jehovah, certain grave breaches of filial and neighbourly duty, and certain typical forms of immorality. The principle upon which the particular offences named are selected is not apparent. Only three of the offences prohibited in the Decalogue are included; and yet, while adultery, for instance, is not noticed, three separate cases of incest are specified. It has, however, often been observed that the offences selected for imprecation are, at least mostly (note "in secret," v.$^{15.24}$),

Digitized by Google

such as would not readily be brought to justice before a human tribunal.

The verses agree so indifferently with what precedes that it is hardly possible for them to have been the original sequel of v.$^{11-13}$, or even to have formed part of the original Deuteronomy.

(1) V.$^{11-13}$ speaks of a blessing to be pronounced on Mt. Gerizim, and a curse upon Mt. 'Ebal; and we expect accordingly (cf. 11^{29}) some invocation of blessings and curses upon the two mountains respectively. Instead of this, however, there follows a series of curses alone. The supposition (Keil) that the blessings are omitted, because the law, owing to the sinful character of human nature, brings chiefly a curse to man, is inadequate: this might explain why, for instance, in a general exposition of man's relation to the law, the consequences of human disobedience were dwelt upon more fully and emphatically than those of human obedience (as is actually the case in Dt. 28 and Lev. 26): it does not explain why, when an express arrangement has just been described for pronouncing a blessing upon the people, as well as a curse, instructions should follow for the latter, but not for the former. And v.$^{12f.}$, interpreted in the light of 11$^{26-29}$, seems clearly to point to some description of the consequences, respectively, of Israel's obedience and disobedience, in the same general manner as c. 28, not to an enumeration of twelve particular offences to be visited by God with His curse.

Further, (2) while v.$^{11-13}$ represents the whole people as divided into two halves, six of the tribes (including Levi, which is treated here as a lay-tribe, Ephraim and Manasseh being counted as one) standing on Gerizim for the purpose of blessing, and six on 'Ebal for the purpose of cursing, in v.$^{14-26}$ the *whole* people respond to a series of curses uttered by the Levites alone. Certainly v.^{14} does not necessarily contradict v.^{12} (for v.^{12} might refer to the tribe of Levi in general, while the "Levites" of v.^{14} might denote a minority, selected to officiate on the occasion); but the two representations, taken in the whole, are manifestly inconsistent.

(3) Had the imprecations been the work of the author of Dt., it is natural to suppose that they would have borne some definite relation to the Deut. legislation, and presented an epitome of the sins which he himself deemed the gravest, or the most prejudicial to Israel's welfare. But in point of fact, some of those which he warns the Israelite most earnestly against, are not included in the list (for instance, the worship of "other gods," and the sins characterized by him as Jehovah's "abomination"), while several which are not mentioned elsewhere in Dt. find a place in it. The list being thus constructed without special reference to Dt., it is probable that it is in reality not the work of the author of Dt., but an old liturgical office, used on solemn occasions, which has been inserted by a later hand in the text of Dt., and accommodated to its position there by the addition (or adaptation) of v.^{26}.

14. *The Levites*] *i.e.* (if written from the standpoint of Dt.)

14. קול רם] only here, the usual syn. being קול גדול (2 S. 15^{23} *al.*). Cf. הָרִים קול Is. 13^{2} *al.*

Digitized by Google

members of the tribe of Levi (whether acting as priests, or not); cf. 18^{7} 31^{25}. If written from the standpoint of P, "Levites" in the sense of the inferior, non-priestly members of the tribe (p. 219) will be intended.—*Answer*] in the sense of "begin to speak," as 21^{7}.—**15.** *Cursed*] a formula of imprecation, used sometimes colloquially, as the expression of a merely human disapproval, Jos. 9^{23} (JE) 1 S. 26^{19} (with "before Jehovah"), Jer. $20^{14.15}$, sometimes in connexion with an oath, involving grave consequences for the persons concerned Jos. 6^{26} (with "before Jehovah"), Jud. 21^{18} 1 S. $14^{24.28}$, sometimes on a prophet's lips, or in the mouth of God Himself, as the emphatic declaration of a Divine sentence, as here and v.$^{15-26}$; cf. Gen. $3^{14.17}$ 4^{11} 9^{25} 27^{29} (=Nu. 24^{9}) 49^{7} Dt. 28^{16-19} Jer. 11^{3} 17^{5} 48^{10} Mal. 1^{14}†, Ps. 119^{21} (disregarding accents). The copula is unexpressed in the Heb.; and *is*, *be*, or *shall be*, must be understood, according to the context. Here *is* is most suitable.—*Jehovah's abomination*] 7^{25}.—*The work of the hands of the craftsman* (מעשה ידי חרש)] so Jer. 10^{3}; comp. *ib.* v.^{9} Hos. 13^{2}; also Hos. 8^{6} Is. $40^{19.20}$ 41^{7} 44^{11-13} 45^{16}.—*In secret*] cf. $13^{7(6)}$. Even the secret idolater (Job 31^{27}) does not elude the Divine judgment.—*Amen* (אָמֵן)] lit. an adj. *firm*, *assured*, used adverbially, as an emphatic expression of assent, *assuredly*, *verily*, 1 K. 1^{36} Jer. 11^{5} 28^{6} (ironically), Neh. 5^{13}; as a liturgical formula Nu. 5^{22} (אמן אמן); as here, and v.$^{15-26}$, in the mouth of the people generally Neh. 8^{6} (אמן אמן), and in the doxology to the fourth book of the Psalms, Ps. 106^{48} (so 1 Ch. 16^{36}), cf. Ps. 41^{14} 72^{19} 89^{53} (אמן ואמן). Only twice besides (differently) Is. $65^{16.16}$. It is true, the other examples of the use of *Amen*, which are perfectly parallel to this, are post-exilic; but the passages in Kings and Jeremiah are proof that the term itself was used at a much earlier period; and there is no sufficient ground for supposing that it was not employed, as a solemn liturgical formula, in pre-exilic times.—**16.** *Dishonoureth* (מַקְלֶה)] not so strong as מְקַלֵּל "curseth" (Ex. 21^{17} Lev. 20^{9}); but the exact opposite of the "Honour" (כַּבֵּד) of the Decalogue. Both קָלָה and the cognate subst. קָלוֹן (*ignominy*, *disgrace*) are often opposed to כַּבֵּד and

15. אשר יעשה . . . וְשָׂם] Jud. 1^{12} 1 S. 17^{26} *al.* (Dr. § 115).

Digitized by Google

כָּבוֹד *honour*; see (in the Heb.) Is. 3^5 16^{14} (AV. "brought into contempt"), Pr. 12^9; Hos. 4^7 Hab. 2^{18} Pr. 3^{35}; and cf. c. 25^3.—**18.** *That maketh . . . to go astray* (מַשְׁגֶּה) *in the way*] cf. Pr. 28^{10} Job 12^{16}.—**19.** *That wresteth, &c.*] 24^{17}.—**20.** *Uncovered his father's skirt*] see on 23^1 (22^{30}).—**22.** *The daughter of his father, or the daughter of his mother, i.e.* his half-sister by either parent: so Lev. 18^9 20^{17}. Marriage of the first kind here specified, viz. with a half-sister not uterine, was more anciently deemed admissible (see Gn. 20^{12}; and in the time of David 2 S. 13^{13b}); it was practised in Jerusalem in Ezekiel's day, but reprobated by the prophet (22^{11}). Relationship on the father's side was regarded as not so close as relationship on the mother's side. Cf. Smith, *OTJC.*[2] p. 370; and on the same practice among the Phœnicians and elsewhere, *Kinship*, p. 162 f.—**24.** *That smiteth . . . in secret*] not the usual expression for murder: no doubt chosen here for the purpose of embracing in the curse even the murderer who is successful in escaping detection by human justice. בסתר, as v.[15] 13^7 28^{57}; of other crimes, 2 S. 12^{12} Ps. 101^5 Job 13^{10} 31^{27}.—**25.** *That taketh a bribe to slay an innocent person*] in 16^{19} Ex. 23^8 the receiving of bribes is forbidden generally, not with reference to the special case here contemplated. Cf. Ez. 22^{12} "in thee have they taken bribes to shed blood."—**26.** *The words of this law*] *i.e.*, as v.[3], of the Deuteronomic law.—*Confirmeth* (יקים)] lit. *causeth to stand up, i.e.* giveth effect to (comp. ἱστῶμεν Rom. 3^{31}), as 2 K. $23^{3.24}$ (of Josiah, in the same connexion); also 1 S. $15^{11.13}$ Jer. 35^{14} *al.*

XXVIII. *Peroration to the Deuteronomic Legislation.*

XXVIII. A solemn declaration of the blessings (v.[1-14]), and the curses (v.[15-68]), which Israel may expect to attend the observance or neglect of the Deuteronomic law.—The Deuteronomic Code, like the Law of Holiness (Lev. 26^{3-45}), follows the precedent of the Book of the Covenant, which ends with a

25. לְהַכּוֹת נפשׁ דם נקי] "to smite a soul (Lev. $24^{17.18}$ Nu. $35^{11.15.30}$: cf. 'to smite *as to* the soul,' c. 19^{11}), (even) innocent blood": דם נקי is in appos. with נפש, in virtue of the principle הדם הוא הנפש 12^{23}.

Digitized by Google

passage of similar import (Ex. 23^{20-33}). The chapter forms an eloquent and impressive peroration to the great exposition of Israel's duty which has preceded (c. 5–26): in sustained declamatory power, it stands unrivalled in the OT. In its general literary character, it resembles the prophetic discourse of Jer. or Ez., rather than that of one of the earlier prophets: but it displays greater regularity of form, and artistic completeness, than is common in Jeremiah; and a larger variety of ideas than Ez. usually throws into a *single* prophecy. The blessings and the curses open symmetrically ($v.^{1-7}$; $v.^{15-19}$); but, these verses ended, the treatment in each case becomes freer, the curses being developed at much greater length than the blessings, and indeed forming the most characteristic feature of the chapter. The scheme of this part of the discourse should be noted. It does not consist, as in Lev. 26 (see p. 304), of a series of stages, one following another chronologically, and each induced by the failure of the preceding one to effect a reformation in Israel's character; it is developed in a series of *parallel* pictures of the calamities which Israel may expect, each ending in national disaster or ruin, the last two presenting a more appalling prospect than the others ($v.^{20-26.\ 27-37.\ 38-44.\ 49-57.\ 58-68}$). A recurrence of substantially the same thought, though usually in different language, may be noted more than once ($v.^{21f.\ 27.\ 35.\ 60}$; $v.^{25.\ 37}$; $v.^{28.\ 34}$; $v.^{31.\ 51}$; $v.^{32.\ 41}$; $v.^{36f.\ 64}$); but in most cases this is attributable to the plan of the discourse, just explained; and only twice is the repetition alien to the context in which it now stands, and liable consequently to the suspicion of being interpolated ($v.^{35}$; $v.^{41}$). In general style and phraseology the discourse is thoroughly Deuteronomic; though naturally (on account of the special character of the subject-matter) it contains several words and phrases not found elsewhere in Dt. The occurrence in it of expressions of which Jeremiah makes more frequent use ($v.^{20b.\ 25b.\ 26.\ 37}$) is not sufficient to show interpolation from him; the other parts of Dt. afford little or no occasion for the repetition of such expressions, whereas Jer. (who in other instances also borrows largely from Dt., and is besides singularly apt to repeat the phrases which he uses)

Digitized by Google

might consistently with his general practice both appropriate and repeat them. See, further, against the supposition either that c. 28 is a later addition, by another hand, to the main body of Dt., or that it has been to any appreciable extent interpolated, Kuenen, *Hex.* § 7. 21 (2). It is particularly to be noted that deportation to a foreign land (v.$^{36. 37. 41. 63-68}$) is not the *sole* prospect which the author holds out before his people, it is but one beside many other afflictions, most of which are to fall upon Israel in its own land (failure of crops, &c.).

It may be worth while to compare c. 28 briefly with the corresponding discourses in Ex. 23^{20-33} and Lev. 26^{3-45}. In Ex. the treatment is considerably briefer as well as more special; the rewards of obedience consisting in fertility and health for land and people, success in the struggle with the Canaanites, wide and secure territory, and the penalty of disobedience being touched on only in a single verse (v.^{21b}). There is no appreciable literary dependence of Dt. 28 upon Ex. 23^{20-33}. In Lev. 26 the subject is developed in a style and manner bearing a greater general resemblance to Dt. 28: the rewards of obedience (v.$^{3-13}$) are fertility of the soil, success against foes, and Jehovah's favourable presence with His people; the penalties of disobedience are, successively, disease and defeat by foes (v.$^{14-17}$), drought (v.$^{18-20}$), country ravaged by wild animals (v.$^{21-22}$), invasion by foe, siege, and pestilence (v.$^{23-26}$), desolation of cities and land, and scattering among the nations (v.$^{27-33}$), in misery and distress (v.$^{34-39}$), followed by a promise of restoration in the event of the exiled Israelites repenting (v.$^{40-45}$). Although, however, the thought in Lev. 26 is in several instances parallel to that in Dt. 28, and here and there one of the two chapters even appears to contain a verbal reminiscence of the other (comp. Dt. $28^{22. 23. 53. 65b}$ with Lev. $26^{16. 19. 29. 16}$ respectively), the treatment in the two cases is different, and the phraseology, in so far as it is characteristic, is almost entirely distinct, Lev. 26 presenting affinities with Ezekiel (*L.O.T.* p. 140), Dt. 28 with Jeremiah: in fact, the two chapters present two independent elaborations of the same theme.

1–14. The blessings of obedience.—Comp. above 7^{12-16} $11^{13-15. 22-25}$. V.$^{1-2}$ introductory.—**1.** *And it shall come to pass*] as remarked on pp. 294, 298, these words, continuing the discourse of Moses, stand in no connexion with 27^{14-26}, and were once probably the immediate sequel of 26^{16-19} or 27^{9-10}.—*If thou shalt hearken diligently* (ואם שמוע תשמע)] 11^{13} 15^{5}: cf. Ex. 23^{22} (also Ex. 15^{26} 19^{5}).—*Will set thee on high, &c.*] as 26^{19}.—*Come upon thee and overtake thee*] the blessings, like the curses, v.$^{15. 45}$, are almost personified, and represented as

Digitized by Google

pursuing their objects, like living agents. For *overtake* (השיג), cf. Job 27^{20} Is. 59^{9} Ps. 40^{13}.

3–6. Prosperity in every department of the national life.—Six clauses, each introduced by *Blessed*, specifying the nature and range of the blessings just promised: city and country will alike be prosperous; offspring of men and cattle, and the produce of the soil, will be abundant and healthy; the fruits of the earth will be safely gathered in and stored; success will attend every enterprise upon which the Israelite embarks.—**4.** *The fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy ground*] 7^{13} (cf. also below, v.$^{11. 18. 33. 42. 51. 53}$ 30^{9}); the thought (but not the expression) as Ex. 23^{26}.—*The increase of thy kine, &c.*] see on 7^{13}.—**5.** *Thy basket and thy kneading-trough*] *i.e.* the vessels used for garnering and utilizing the fruits of the earth.—*Basket* (טֶנֶא)] v.^{17} $26^{2. 4}$†.—*Kneading-trough*] v.^{17} Ex. 7^{28} 12^{34}†.—**6.** *When thou comest in, and when thou goest out*] the same phrase, denoting the completion, and the beginning, of an undertaking, 31^{2} Jos. 14^{11} 1 K. 3^{7} Is. 37^{28} Ps. 121^{8}.

7–10. Victory against foes; prosperous seasons; Jehovah's favour; the respect of the world.—**7.** The form of the discourse here changes; and the thoughts expressed compactly in v.$^{3-6}$ are freely expanded.—**7.** *Smitten before thee*] 1^{42} (Nu. 14^{42}) Jud. $20^{32. 39}$ *al.*—*They shall come out against thee one way, and shall flee before thee seven ways*] the compact and steady array of the advancing troops of the foe is contrasted effectively with their dispersion, in manifold directions, after the defeat. Comp. Ex. $23^{22. 27}$ Lev. $26^{7f.}$.—**8.** *Jehovah command the blessing . . .; and bless thee, &c.*] in the Heb. the form of the verb is jussive (יְצַו), significant of the eagerness with which the orator watches and desires the future which he announces. So (at least as pointed) v.$^{21. 36}$. If the form be original here, the jussive rend. should be retained throughout; 𝕲 uses the opt. from v.^{7} to v.^{36}.—*Command the blessing*] Lev. 25^{21} Ps. 133^{3}.—*With thee* (אִתְּךָ)] *i.e.* so that it may accompany thee in all thy labours. Not "upon thee."—*Thy barns* (אסמיך)] Pr. 3^{10}†.—*In all that thou puttest thy hand to*] 12^{7}.—**9.** *Jehovah will establish thee unto himself for an holy people* (7^{6} 14^{2} 26^{19}), *as he sware unto thee*] He will confirm the honourable position

Digitized by Google

promised in Ex. $19^{5f.}$ (though no oath is there mentioned), with the respect (v.^{10}), and various material advantages (v.$^{11-14}$), thereby ensured.—*Seeing that* (כִּי) *thou wilt be keeping, &c.*] 8^{6}. The entire paragraph, from v.^{2} to v.^{14}, is an apodosis dependent upon the "if" (אִם) of v.^{1}; but here (as again in v.^{13}) the condition upon which the promised blessing depends is adverted to indirectly by a clause introduced with כִּי, "*when*, or *seeing that* (in the case supposed) thou wilt keep," &c. (comp. philol. note on 12^{20}).—**10.** *All the peoples of the earth*] comp. esp. Jos. 4^{24} (D^{2}) 1 K. 8^{43} (= 2 Ch. 6^{33}) ^{60} (all Deut.), Zeph. 3^{20}; also 1 K. 8^{53} Ez. 31^{12}†.—*Shall see that Jehovah's name is called over thee*] *i.e.* that He is thy Owner, and, as such, surrounds thee with His protection (cf. Is. 61^{9}).

The sense of the phrase appears clearly from 2 S. 12^{28}, where Joab, while besieging Rabbah, sends to urge David to come in person and take it, "lest *I* (emph.) take the city, and *my name be called over it*," *i.e.* lest I gain the credit of having captured it, and it be counted as my conquest. The phrase expresses thus the fact of *ownership*—whether acquired by actual conquest or otherwise (Is. 4^{1} Ps. $49^{12\,(11)}$)—coupled at the same time with the idea of *protection*; and occurs frequently, especially with reference to the people of Israel, Jerusalem, or the Temple. The passages are: Amos 9^{12} Jer. $7^{10.\,11.\,14.\,30}$ 14^{9} 15^{16} (of Jer. himself), 25^{29} 32^{34} 34^{15} 1 K. 8^{43} (Deut.) = 2 Ch. 6^{33} Is. 63^{19} 2 Ch. 7^{14} Dan. $9^{18.\,19}$. It is to be regretted that, in the English Versions, the phrase is generally paraphrased obscurely, "called by my name" (which really corresponds to a different expression נקרא בשמי Is. 43^{7}, cf. 48^{1} Nu. 32^{42}); but the literal rendering, which in this case happens to be both clearer and more forcible than the paraphrase, is sometimes given on the margin of RV. (*e.g.* on 1 K. 8^{43}).

Shall be afraid of thee] as enjoying, viz., thus visibly, Jehovah's all-powerful protection (cf. 2^{25} 11^{25}).

11–14. Wealth accruing from Jehovah's blessing, and consequent material superiority over other nations.—**11.** *Make thee have in excess* (הוֹתִירְךָ)] 30^{9}; cf. 2 K. $4^{43.\,44}$ Ru. 2^{14} ("leave thereof": lit. *have in excess, leave over*). More than "plenteous" (RV.).—*Unto good*] *i.e.* unto prosperity: so 30^{9}.—**12.** *His good treasury*] *i.e.* the celestial reservoirs, in which the rain was conceived by the Hebrews to be stored (Gn. 7^{11} 8^{2}), "the waters above the firmament" of Gn. 1^{7}; the figure, as Job 38^{22} Jer. 10^{13} = 51^{16} (Ps. 135^{7}).—*To give the rain of thy land in its season*] cf. 11^{14}; also Lev. 26^{4} (ונתתי גשמיכם בעתם).—*And to bless all the work of thine hand*] with especial reference to agricultural undertakings;

Digitized by Google

cf. 14^{29}, and on 2^{7}.—*Thou shalt lend unto many nations, but thou shalt not borrow*] viz. on account of the abundance of thy wealth. Cf. 15^{6}; also Ps. 37^{26}.—**13.** *The head, and not the tail, &c.*] Israel will take an honourable position at the head of the nations; it will *be tending only upwards, and not tending downwards, i.e.* it will be ever rising in reputation and importance (cf. v.^{1} 26^{19}): it will not be suppressed or forgotten among other peoples, more fortunate and powerful than itself. For the fig. use of "head" and "tail," comp. Is. $9^{13f. (14f.)}$ 19^{15}. "For some Arabic parallels, see the *ZDMG.* 1892, p. 180" (W.R.S.).—**13–14.** *Seeing that* (כִּי) *thou wilt be hearkening . . . and turning not aside, &c.*] the condition, as v.^{9}. For the phrases, cf. 4^{6}; $5^{29 (32)}$; 6^{14} 8^{19} $13^{3 (2)}$.

15–68. The curses of disobedience.—Comp. 4^{25-28} 7^{4} $8^{19f.}$ $11^{16f.}$ (but as a penalty for idolatry only). V.^{15} is introductory, agreeing completely in form with v.$^{1-2}$, except that two subordinate clauses are not represented; v.$^{16-19}$ correspond precisely to v.$^{3-6}$ (only v.$^{17.\ 18}$ being interchanged). With v.^{20} the form changes, as with v.^{8} in the blessings; but the correspondence with the blessings, in literary treatment, is not afterwards maintained, the subject being developed at much greater length.

16–19. Failure in every department of national life.—The expressions correspond exactly to those used v.$^{3-6}$; see the notes there.

20–26. Disastrous years, pestilential fevers, exhausting droughts, ruinous defeat in battle.—20. *Cursing* (Mal. 2^{2}), *and discomfiture* (7^{23}), *and rebuke, in all that thou puttest thine hand unto*] the opposite of v.^{8}. In the Hebrew, *cursing, discomfiture*, and *rebuke* have each את, with the article; they are specified with emphasis, and almost treated as material agencies (cf. v.^{2}).—*Which thou shalt do* (AV. *for to do*)] $14^{29\ end}$.—*Until thou be destroyed* (עד השמדך)] repeated, with knell-like effect, v.$^{24.\ 45.\ 51.\ 61}$; cf. 7^{23}.—*And until thou perish quickly*] cf. v.^{22}; 4^{26} 11^{17} Jos. 23^{16} (D^{2}).—*The evil of thy doings*

XXVIII. 13. רק למעלה] רק=*nothing but, altogether*, as v.^{33} Gn. 6^{5} (רק רע) Is. 28^{19}. Cf. אך v.^{29}.—**20.** המארה] Mal. 2^{2} (a reminiscence), 3^{9} Pr. 3^{33} 28^{27}†.—המגערת] not elsewhere: cf. נער Mal. 2^{3}.

(רֹעַ מַעֲלָלֶיךָ)] Hos. 9^15 Is. 1^16 Ps. 28^4, and esp. in Jer.,—as here, with *because of*, Jer. 4^4 21^12 26^3 44^22, also 23^2. 22 25^5. מעללים is a word which (except 1 S. 25^3) is confined to the more elevated prose, as Jud. 2^19 (Deut.), and esp. Jeremiah (17 times). Only here in Dt.—*Me*] on 7^4.—**21.** *Make the pestilence* (הַדֶּבֶר) *cleave*] in the Heb. the verb is pointed as a jussive; cf. v.^8. דֶּבֶר is a very general term, denoting what we should call an *epidemic*, accompanied by great mortality: it is often mentioned in the OT., *e.g.* Am. 4^10 1 K. 8^37; esp. in Jer. (in the combination, "the sword, the famine, and the pestilence"); threatened, as here, in Lev. 26 (v.^25) ושלחתי דבר בתוככם.—*Whither thou goest in, &c.*] 7^1.—**22.** Seven further plagues, the first four being such as affect human beings, and the last three injurious to crops.—*Consumption and fever* (בשחפת ובקדחת)] so Lev. 26^16.—*Inflammation and fiery heat* (ובדלקת ובחרחר)] not elsewhere.—*Drought*] so Sam. 𝔙, Saad.: Heb. "with the sword" (וּבַחֶרֶב): but in this connexion the sword is out of place; and "drought" (וּבְחֹרֶב) is decidedly preferable (so Ges., Kn., Di., Oettli). How calamitous a drought might be in Palestine, hardly needs illustration: see *e.g.* 11^17 1 K. 8^35 17^1ff. Am. 4^7f. Jer. 14^2-6 Hag. 1^11.—*Blasting and mildew* (ובשדפון ובירקון)] so 1 K. 8^37 (Deut.) = 2 Ch. 6^28 Am. 4^9 Hag. 2^17. With *blasting*, cf. Gn. 41^6. 23. 27 (שדופות קדים); the reference is to the deleterious effects of the hot and withering East wind (Hos. 13^15 Jon. 4^8). —**23–24.** The consequences of the drought, mentioned in v.^22. —**23.** *Thy heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, &c.*] Lev. 26^19 "And I will make your heaven as iron, and your earth as brass."—**24.** *The rain of thy land powder and dust*] in consequence of the drought, dust and sand being blown down, instead of rain, upon the thirsty soil. In the sirocco, this is sometimes the case in Palestine: "The wind continued to increase in violence and heat, and the atmosphere was now full of dust and sand; the glow of the air was like the mouth of a furnace" (*BR.* ii. 123).—**25.** *Shall cause thee to be smitten, &c.*] exactly reversing the blessing of v.^7. Cf. Lev. 26^17.

25. זעוה] from זוע *to shake* (Eccl. 12^3), *move in fear, tremble* (Est. 5^9), more common in Aram. (𝔗 *tremble*, Syr. *totter, quake, tremble*; זועא *tremor*, σεισμός, *trembling*); here of the object at which one trembles (cf. קְהָפָה Jer.

Digitized by Google

There follows, however, an aggravation of the fate pronounced, v.^{7}, upon Israel's foes.—*And thou shalt be a shuddering* (לְזַעֲוָה) *unto all the kingdoms of the earth*] *i.e.* an awe-inspiring spectacle: so Jer. 15^{4} 24^{9} 29^{18} 34^{17} (in all, "And I will give them (you) to be a shuddering unto all the kingdoms of the earth," with reference to the impending exile of Judah); cf. Ez. 23^{46} 2 Ch. 29^{8}.—*Kingdoms of the earth*] also freq. in Jer., viz. 15^{4} 24^{9} 25^{26} (but see 𝔊), 29^{18} $34^{1.17}$ Is. 23^{17} 2 K. $19^{15.19}$ (Deut.) = Is. $37^{16.20}$ 2 Ch. 36^{23} (= Ezr. 1^{2}) Ps. 68^{33}†.—**26.** The inglorious end of the Israelite warriors.—*Thy carcases shall become meat unto all fowls of the heaven, and unto the beasts of the earth*] so Jer. 7^{33} 16^{4} 19^{7} (with *I will give*), 34^{20}†; cf. 1 S. $17^{44.46}$ Ps. 79^{2}.—*And there shall be none to fray them away* (ואין מחריד)] no friend will remain to save Israel's corpses from such dishonour. So Jer. 7^{33} (just quoted); the phrase also occurs frequently (10 times) besides, but in a different connexion, of dwelling, or lying down, undisturbed (as Lev. 26^{6} Is. 17^{2}).

27–37. Loathsome and incurable diseases, mental infatuation and blindness, resulting in Israel's falling a prey to foreign invaders, and being led finally into an ignominious exile.—27. The new paragraph starts with a fresh denunciation of the bodily plagues, with which Israel, if disobedient, may expect to be smitten.—*The boil of Egypt* (בִּשְׁחִין מִצְרַיִם)] the "boil" (שחין)—properly, *inflamed spot*, the root in the cognate languages, Arab. Aram. Eth., having the sense of *to be hot* or *inflamed*—is mentioned also v.^{35} Ex. $9^{9.10.11}$ Lev. $13^{18.19.20}$ (a symptom of elephantiasis) ^{23} (a common ulcer), 2 K. 20^{7} = Is. 38^{21} Job 2^{7}†. The "boil of Egypt" must denote some form of cutaneous disease, peculiarly prevalent in Egypt. Not impossibly elephantiasis (see v.^{35}) is meant, which was especially associated by the ancients with Egypt;* but the expression does not point distinctively to that; and as cutaneous

48^{39}; פחר Ps. 31^{2}; &c.). Ges. *divexatio*; Ew. (§ 72^{b}) *play-ball*; but only the reduplicated form ועזע (Hab. 2^{7}, and in Aram.) has the meaning *shake to and fro*.—**26.** נבלתך] collect., as Is. 26^{19}.

* Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 26. 1 § 5) calls it "Ægypti peculiare malum"; and Lucretius (vi. 1114 f.) writes, "Est elephas morbus, qui propter flumina Nili Gignitur Ægypto in media, neque præterea usquam."

Digitized by Google

eruptions, of various kinds, are common in Egypt (on 7[15]), some other kind of endemic boil or malignant pustule (cf. J. R. Bennett, *Diseases of the Bible*, p. 64 f.) may be intended. —*Tumours* (וּבַעְפָלִים) 1 S. 5[6. 9. 12] 6[4. 5]†. Properly *swellings*,—generally understood of hæmorrhoidal swellings in the anus (Ges. Ke.); the Arab. *ʿafal* has a similar meaning.

In view, however, partly of the position of the word here between two other terms denoting affections of the skin, partly of the rapid diffusion of the עפלים among the Philistines (1 S. 5–6), and of the fact that the mouse (cf. *Samuel*, p. 48) was regarded in antiquity as the emblem of a pestilence, it is thought by others that *plague-boils* (RV. 2nd margin) are meant (so Hitzig, *Urgesch. der Philistäer*, 1845, p. 201; Thenius on 1 S. 5[6]; Schultz, *ad loc.*; Wellh. *Sam.* p. 64; Dillm. also inclines; Hastings' *DB.* iii. 325).

With the scab (ובגרב) *and with the itch* (ובחרס)] the *gārāb* is mentioned Lev. 21[20] 22[22]; the *ḥeres* only here. In Arabic, *jarab* is a contagious eruption consisting of pustules, the *mange* or *scab*; and *ḥarasha* and *charasha* both mean *to scratch*. 𝔊 ψώρα ἀγρία (so Lev. *l.c.*) καὶ κνήφη; 𝔙 scabies et prurigo. Similar skin complaints are still common in Syria and Egypt; here they are specially signalized as incurable.—**28.** *Madness and blindness and astonishment of heart*] *i.e.* mental infatuation, resulting (v.[29]) in ill-considered and disastrous public policy (comp. in illustration of the term, though not of its application in the present passage, 1 S. 21[15-16] 2 K. 9[20]), blind incapacity to perceive what the times require (cf. Is. 29[9. 10. 18]), and paralysis of reason in presence of unexpected disaster (cf. Jer. 4[9] Is. 13[8]). Comp. the same three words (but without "of heart") Zech. 12[4], of a panic, seizing horses and horsemen, and rendering them helpless in the fray.—**29.** *And thou shalt be groping at noonday, as the blind gropeth in darkness*] cf. Job 5[14] Is. 59[10] Zeph. 1[17]. Israel will be reduced mentally to a condition worse than that of those who are physically blind; it will be helpless when all ought really to be clear before it. With the graphic "shalt *be groping*," comp. Is. 30[20] "shall

27. ובעפלים] the Kt. is וּבָעֳפָלִים: the vowels of the Qrê belong to וּבַטְּחֹרִים. עפלים appears to have been regarded by the Massorites as a coarse, or indecent, word: for, wherever it occurs, they direct the reader to substitute טחרים (which has twice, 1 S. 6[11. 17], found its way into the text). The meaning of טחרים is obscure: see the note, p. XXII.—אשר]=*so that*, as v.[35. 51] &c.—**29.** והיית ממשש] cf. on 9[7].—אך] as 16[15] אך שמח.

be beholding," 59[2] "have *come to be separating*," Mark 13[25] ἔσονται ἐκπίπτοντες.—*Thou shalt not make thy ways to prosper*] the lines of action adopted by Israel, in its national capacity, will result in disaster. For the phrase, cf. (lit.) Gn. 24[40], (metaph.), as here, Jos. 1[8] (D[2]).—*Oppressed* (Jer. 50[33]) *and robbed continually*] viz. by foreign assailants.—**30–34.** Different ways in which the foreign invader will "oppress and rob" the Israelites, viz. by depriving them of contemplated domestic enjoyments, by appropriating their possessions, by carrying their children into slavery, and by plundering their crops.—**30.** *Thou shalt betroth a wife, &c.*] cf. 20[7].—*Shall ravish her*] the Heb. word is a strong one, implying indelicate treatment, such as might be expected at the hands of a captor (comp. Is. 13[16] Zech. 14[2]; elsewhere only Jer. 3[2]).—*And not use the fruit thereof*] see on 20[6].—With the general thought of this verse, comp. Am. 5[11b] Mic. 6[15] Zeph. 1[13] Jer. 6[12] 8[10] (contrast Is. 65[21f.]); also Jer. 5[17].—**31.** *Before thine eyes*] whilst thou art looking on, unable to raise a hand to prevent it. Cf. on 1[30]; and Is. 1[7] (לנגדכם).—*And thou shalt have no saviour*] the thought of Israel's friendlessness, while thus pitilessly plundered, is repeated pathetically from v.[29].—**32.** *While thine eyes look, and fail with longing* (Lam. 4[17]) *for them all the day*] the parents watch their children carried off into exile and slavery, and long despairingly to see them again.—*And it shall not be in the power of thy hand* (to help it)] so Neh. 5[5]; see below.—**33.** *Which thou knowest not*] cf. v.[36], and on 13[7 (6)]; also Jer. 14[18] 15[14] 17[4] 22[28].—*Eat up*] Lev. 26[16b].—*Oppressed and crushed continually*] viz. by extortion, injustice, and violence (cf. v.[29]). For *crushed* (רָצוּץ), see 1 S. 12[3.4] Am. 4[1] (in both, ‖ עָשַׁק; see on 24[14]), Is. 58[6]; Jer. 22[17] (מְרוּצָה, ‖ עֹשֶׁק).—**34.** *And thou shalt be maddened because of, &c.*] the appalling spectacle of wasted lands and ruined homes (v.[30-33]) will madden (cf. v.[28]) the survivors, and drive them to desperation.—**35.** Israel will, moreover, be smitten with the terrible scourge of leprosy. The verse is

31. מלפני] "from *before*," "from *the sight of*" (note the ‖ לעיניך): cf. 1 S. 21[17] Lev. 22[3] Ps. 51[13] *al.*, and on 17[18].—נתונות] צאן is construed regularly as a *fem. pl.*—**32.** כָּלוֹת] from כָּלָה, the verbal adj., of the same form as רָוֶה, דָּוֶה, [חָרֶה], f. חָרָה, &c.—ואין לאל ידך] cf. with יֵשׁ Gn. 31[29] Pr. 3[27] Mic. 2[1]†. The ל is the ל of norm, *according to* (11[11]).

Digitized by Google

open to the suspicion of being interpolated or misplaced; for it repeats the thought of v.[27] in a slightly altered form, and interrupts the connexion between v.[32-34] and v.[36-37].—*Upon the knees and upon the legs with an evil boil*] on "boil," see on v.[27]. From the stress laid on the knees and legs, it is probable that the disease meant is that species of elephantiasis known as the "joint-leprosy," or technically, from the fact that the nerves affected by it lose sensation, as the *Anæsthetic* elephantiasis, which "attacks the joints of the fingers and toes, and afterwards those of the larger limbs, which drop off bone by bone," while "the limbs which are affected but do not ulcerate become at last so completely devoid of sensation that portions of them may be burnt, or otherwise injured, without the person being conscious of it" (see the Report of the College of Physicians on Leprosy, quoted in the *Speaker's Comm.* i. 561). The other species of leprosy, consisting of ulcerous tubercles, is called the *Tuberculated.* The expression, "smote with an evil boil, from the sole of his foot to his crown," is used also in the description of Job's complaint (Job 2[7]), which the symptoms referred to—*e.g.* Job 2[8] 7[3-6] 17[7] 19[17] (RV. 2nd marg.) [20] 30[17]—show must have been one form or other of the same terrible malady.—**36–37.** The climax of the series of disasters described in v.[28-34]: the nation itself, with its king, abandoned finally by Jehovah, and led into an ignominious exile.—**36.** *Jehovah bring thee*] the Heb. is pointed as a jussive: cf. v.[8].—*And thy king*] powerless to aid thee. Cf. 17[14f.]; 2 K. 24[14-16] 25[6ff.].—*Which thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers*] v.[33]; also v.[64b] 13[7 (6)]. Comp. Jer. 9[15 (16)] 16[13a].—*And there shalt thou serve other gods, wood and stone*] v.[64] 4[28]; also Jer. 16[13b].—**37.** *And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword, &c.*] viz. by the fall from thy high estate, and the unprecedented calamities overtaking thee. Hence Jer. 24[9] 1 K. 9[7] (Deut.) = 2 Ch. 7[20].—*Astonishment*] Jer. 18[16] 19[8] 25[9. 18] *al.*—*Byword* (שְׁנִינָה)] Jer. 24[9] 1 K. 9[7] 2 Ch. 7[20]†. Lit. the object of *sharp* or *cutting* remarks.—*Will lead thee*] 4[27].

38–44. Failure of crops, impoverishing Israel, and reducing it to a state of dependence upon the foreigner resident in its midst.—The paragraph starts from nearly the same point as

Digitized by Google

v.[22], and is in designed contrast to v.[8. 11-13a].—**38–40.** The corn, the wine, and the oil, the three staple productions of Palestine (7[13]), in spite of the provision made for an abundant yield, will be destroyed by plagues of insects.—**38.** *Thou shalt carry much seed, &c.*] cf. Hag. 1[6]; Mic. 6[15a].—*Shall finish it* (יחסלנה)] the word occurs only here: in Aram. it means *bring to an end. Ḥāsil*, one of the Heb. words for a locust, 1 K. 8[37] Is. 33[4] (A.V. *caterpillar*), is derived from the same root.—**39.** *Thou shalt plant vineyards, &c.*] Zeph. 1[13].—*Nor gather in* (the grapes)] or *store*: אגר denotes not gathering from the trees, but gathering into stores (Pr. 6[8] 10[5]†).—*The worm*] "in all probability the ἶψ, ἶξ of the Greeks (Theophr. *Caus. Pl.* iii. 22. 5 f.; Strabo, xiii. 1. 64), a worm or grub that destroys vine-buds, the *convolvulus* of the Romans (Plin. *H. N.* 17. 47), the vine-weevil, an insect very injurious to vineyards" (Knobel).—**40.** *Not anoint thyself with oil*] so Mic. 6[15b]. On the practice of anointing, comp. 2 S. 12[20] 14[2] Ru. 3[3] 2 Ch. 28[15]; also Am. 6[6] Is. 61[3] Eccl. 9[8] Ps. 23[5].—*For thine olives shall drop off*] see below.—**41.** The children born to Israel will go into captivity. The verse interrupts the connexion, and seems to be superfluous after v.[32].—**42.** *The cricket* (הצלצל)] the word occurs only here; and the particular insect meant is uncertain, though it must evidently have been one destructive to trees and crops. Probably one of the many species of locust (Tristram, *NHB.* p. 307 ff.) is intended. The root from which the word is derived means *to clang* or *jingle*: so doubtless the insect denoted by it is so designated from the stridulous sound of its wings.—*Possess*] Is. 34[11] (cf. 14[23]) Hos. 9[6].—**43.** Israel will thus be steadily impoverished, while the "stranger" (10[19]), who is not in the same degree dependent permanently upon the soil of Palestine, will increase in power and wealth, till a condition the reverse of that promised in v.[12b-13a] is reached, and the Israelite is compelled to borrow of him in order to procure the necessaries of life.

40. בכל גבולך] 16[4] (Ex. 13[7]).—ושמן לא תסוך] Mic. 6[15] 2 S. 14[2].—ישל] *drop off*: see on 7[1]. זית of the fruit, as Mic. 6[15].—**42.** ירש] the Pi. in this sense only here: Jud. 14[15] differently. Perh. יירש should be read (cf. Is. 34[11] Hos. 9[6]).—**43.** מעלה מעלה . . . מטה מטה] on 7[23].

Digitized by Google

45–48. Four verses, marking a pause in the discourse. Jehovah's voice has not been hearkened to, hence the calamities enumerated in v.$^{15-44}$; Jehovah has not been served with joyfulness, hence Israel will have to serve its enemies in want, and the disasters described in v.$^{49-68}$ will fall upon it.—V.$^{45-46}$ form thus a conclusion to v.$^{15-44}$; v.$^{47-48}$ are introductory to v.$^{49-68}$.—**45.** *Shall come upon thee, and pursue thee*] v.$^{15b. 22b}$.—*Because thou hearkenedst not*] v.^{15}. The past tense is used (as v.$^{20\ end}$), because the orator places himself in imagination in the time when the destruction is completed.—**46.** *For a sign and for a wonder*] *a sign* witnessing to God's righteous intervention and judgment, *a wonder* (4^{34}) attracting men's attention, and arousing their horror. Comp. $29^{21-27\,(22-28)}$.—*And upon thy seed for ever*] these curses will cling to Israel's posterity for ever, forming a perpetual monument of God's judgment upon wilfulness and sin. The possibility of an ultimate repentance and restoration (4^{29-31} 30^{1-10}) is not here contemplated by the Writer.—**47.** *Servedst not*] as was Israel's duty: 6^{13} 10^{20} $13^{5\,(4)}$.—*With joyfulness, &c.*] such as was due to a God who had lavished upon Israel the tokens of His love ($6^{10ff.}$ 7^{13} &c.), and such as would have been naturally rendered by Israel, had it obeyed the injunction to love Jehovah with an undivided heart (6^{5} &c.).—*Gladness of heart* (טוּב לֵב)] Is. 65^{14}; comp. on 15^{10}.—*By reason of the abundance of all things* (מֵרֹב כֹּל)] which led Israel to forget God, and to offer Him a grudging, half-hearted service (6^{10-12} 32^{13-15}).—**48.** *A yoke of iron*] Jer. 28^{14}.

49–68. Development of v.^{48}, outlining, more terribly than before, the final consequences of Israel's disobedience.

(1.) **49–57. Jehovah will bring against Israel from afar a nation, fierce, destructive, and relentless, who will desolate the country, and besiege the inhabitants in their cities until they are reduced to the horrible necessity of consuming their own offspring.**—**49.** *From afar, from the end of the earth*] comp. Is. 5^{26} (of the Assyrian).—*As the vulture darteth* (יִדְאֶה)] descrying its prey from afar, and alighting swiftly and unerringly

47–48. תחת אשר . . . ועָבַדְתָּ] 4^{37-39}.—**48.** אויביך אשר ישלחנו] v.$^{53b. 55b. 57b}$ (cf. 1 K. 8^{37}) support the correction אויבך (Di.: cf. 21^{10}): comp., however, on 7^{10}—עַד הִשְׁמִידוֹ] on 7^{21}.

Digitized by Google

upon it (Job 9^{26} $39^{29f.}$ Mt. 24^{28}). For the rend. *vulture*, see on 14^{12}. The approach of the Assyrians is likened to the swoop of the same bird in Hos. 8^{1}; and that of the Chaldæans in Hab. 1^{8} Jer. 48^{40} 49^{22}. "Darteth" is a poetical word, occurring only here and Jer. 48^{40} 49^{22} Ps. $18^{11\,(10)}$.—*Whose tongue thou shalt not understand*] cf. Jer. 5^{15}. Isaiah notes the same fact in connexion with the Assyrians (Is. 28^{11} 33^{19}). Both the Assyrians and the Chaldæans spoke a language—that in which the cuneiform inscriptions of Nineveh and Babylon are written—which, though Semitic, and allied to Hebrew, nevertheless differed from it too considerably to be intelligible to the Israelites.—**50.** *Of fierce countenance* (עז פנים)] lit. of *strong* countenance, *i.e.* unyielding, unmoved by considerations of equity or pity, defiant (cf. Ez. 2^{4} קשי פנים; 3^{7} חזקי מצח): so Dan. 8^{23} (of Antiochus Epiphanes); comp. Pr. 7^{13} 21^{29} Eccl. 8^{1}. An unmoved countenance may, under particular circumstances, be a "fierce" one; but Pr. 7^{13} shows that fierceness is not what the expression properly denotes. The direction in which the nation will display itself as unyielding is indicated in the clauses which follow.—*Which shall not regard the person of the old, &c.*] comp. Is. 13^{18} (of the Medes); 47^{6} Lam. 4^{16} $5^{12f.}$ (of the Chaldæans).—**51.** The desolation of the fields and homesteads of Palestine.—*And he shall eat, &c.*] comp. Jer. 5^{17a}. The expressions as before in Dt., v.$^{4.\,20}$ 7^{13}.—**52.** The siege and reduction of the strong places.—*In all thy gates*] *i.e.* cities (on 12^{12}). Stress is laid (in both clauses of the verse) upon the besieging forces pursuing their work in *all* parts of the land.—*Come down*] *i.e.* be reduced: cf. 20^{20}.—*Wherein thou trustest*] so Jer. 5^{17b}.—*Hath given thee*] the perf., as v.$^{45.\,47}$. Usually the ptcp. ($1^{20.\,25}$ &c.).—**53.** *And thou shalt eat, &c.*] comp. Lev. 26^{29} Jer. 19^{9} Ez. 5^{10}.—*The fruit of thy womb*] v.^{4}.—*In the siege and in the straitness wherewith thine enemy shall straiten thee*] the rather striking phrase recurs, as a kind of refrain, v.$^{55.\,57}$; and is borrowed hence in Jer. 19^{9}.—**54–57.** The thought of v.^{53} is dwelt upon for the purpose of illustrating, in two vivid pictures, the ghastly reversal of natural

49. תשמע] idiom. = *understand*, as Gn. 11^{7} 42^{23} Is. 33^{19}.—**50.** פנים לזקן] periphr. for פני זקן (G-K. § 129).—**52.** והצר לך] 1 K. 8^{37} Jer. 10^{18} *al.*

Digitized by Google

affection, to which the severity of the siege will give rise.—**54.** *Tender . . . and luxurious*] ἁπαλὸς καὶ τρυφερὸς (𝔊). Cf. Is. 47^{1}, of Babylon, under the figure of a lady of rank, living in ease and luxury.—*His eye shall be evil against*] *i.e.* he will regard with disfavour, grudge (15^{9}).—*The wife of his bosom*] $13^{7(6)}$.—**56.** *Who had not adventured, &c.*] being a lady of rank, and therefore accustomed to be borne upon a litter, or to ride in a carriage (Is. $47^{1f.}$).—**56–57.** *Her eye shall be evil against her husband . . . and against her after-birth, &c.*] the expression seems to be used differently in the two verses: she will grudge her husband, her son, and her daughter, a share in the ghastly repast which she is preparing; she will grudge her after-birth, and her children whom she may bear during the siege, even the ordinary treatment which, as a mother, she would naturally give them, putting the one out of sight, and fondly cherishing the other; in her want of all things she will eat both secretly. In illustration of the fact, see 2 K. $6^{28f.}$ Lam. 4^{10} (cf. 2^{20}); also Joseph. *B. J.* vii. 21.

(2.) **58–68. Jehovah will plague Israel with extraordinary afflictions, and even rejoice over them, to expel them from their land; homeless and helpless amongst the nations, their life will be a burden to them; the survivors, finally, offered for sale in an Egyptian slave-market, will find none to purchase them.**—**58.** The Writer begins his closing paragraph with warning Israel once again (cf. v.$^{15.\,45}$) of the fatal mistake which it is yet in its power to avoid.—*All the words of this law*] 17^{19} $27^{3.\,8}$ $29^{28\,(29)}$ 31^{12} 32^{46}.—*That are written in this book*] cf. v.^{61} $29^{19.\,20.\,26\,(20.\,21.\,27)}$ 30^{10}. The expression harmonizes imperfectly with 31^{9} (where Moses is first said to have "written" the Deuteronomic law); and betrays the fact that Deuteronomy was from the first a *written* book.—*This glorious and fearful name*] cf. (of God) 10^{17}.—**59.** The "plagues," extra-

54. הרך בך והענג] for the position of בך, cf. on 7^{14}.—**55.** מִבְּלִי הִשְׁאִיר לוֹ כֹּל] *lit.* "from lack of (9^{28} Is. 5^{13}) one's leaving him anything" = because nothing is left to him. The implicit subj. of השאיר is הַמַּשְׁאִיר (on 15^{2}): הִשְׁאִר (cf. 9^{21}) will be intended as an *inf. c.* with *ḥireq*; but no doubt הַשְׁאִיר should be pointed (see on 3^{3} 7^{24}).—**56.** הצג] for the inversion (הצג כף רגלה would be the normal order), cf. Is. 49^{6} Jud. 9^{24} (Dr. § 208. 3 *Obs.*). The inf. abs. (irreg.), as Is. 42^{24} (G-K. § 113. 1^c^).

Digitized by Google

ordinary, manifold, and persistent, with which Jehovah will, in that case, afflict Israel.—*Make thy plagues* (*stripes*) *wonderful* (והפלא מכותך)] *i.e.* unusual, exceptional for their severity and continuance (lit. *will distinguish, make extraordinary*: 𝔊 excellently *παραδοξάσει*): cf. Is. 29[14] Job 10[16].—*Plagues*] lit. *strokes* or *stripes* (25[3])—not the word used in 24[8] (נֶגַע)—so v.[61] 29[21 (22)]; cf. Lev. 26[21] (ויספתי עליכם מַכָּה), Is. 1[6] ("fresh stripes" RV. *marg.*), Jer. 6[7] ("wounds"), Jer. 19[8] ("plagues"), 30[17] ("wounds"), Pr. 20[30] ("strokes"). It is the subst. corresponding with the ordinary verb rendered *smite* (הִכָּה).—*Of long continuance* (נֶאֱמָנִים)] lit. *assured, i.e.* constant, persistent; comp. of unfailing waters, Is. 33[16] Jer. 15[18]. Usually in a moral application, "trustworthy," "faithful."—**60.** *And he will bring back upon thee all the diseases of Egypt*] from which, in the event of Israel's obedience, He had promised to exempt His people (7[15], with note).—*Which thou dreadest*] 9[19].—*Cleave*] v.[21].—**61.** Even sicknesses and plagues, not expressly named in this book, will be brought upon Israel, in order that its destruction may be secured.—*Sickness and plague* (*stripe*)] so Jer. 6[7].—*The book of this law*] *i.e.* Deuteronomy (cf. 1[5]). Elsewhere the expression used is "this book of the law," 29[20 (21)] 30[10] 31[26] Jos. 1[8].—*Until thou be destroyed*] v.[20. 24. 45. 51].—**62–64.** Hence Israel, now so populous (1[10]), will be left few in number; for Jehovah, who once rejoiced over it to promote its prosperity, will then rejoice over it to ruin it, and expel it from its land.—**62.** *Few in number*] so 4[27]. A reversal of 26[5].—*Instead of your being* (תחת אשר הייתם) *as the stars of heaven for multitude*] 1[10].—*Because thou didst not hearken, &c.*] v.[45], cf. v.[15].—**63.** *Rejoiced over you to do you good* (8[16])] 30[9b] Jer. 32[41] (both times in a promise of restoration).—*To multiply you*] 1[10] 7[13].—*Ye shall be torn away from the land, &c.*] cf. v.[21] 6[15] Jos. 23[13. 15] Jer. 24[10] 2 K. 17[23] 25[21] (with different verbs).—*Whither thou goest in, &c.*] v.[21].—**64.** The survivors, driven from their land, will be dispersed in every quarter of the earth, and there sink completely into heathenism. Comp. 4[27f.].—*Shall scatter*

59. מַכּוֹתְךָ] G-K. § 91. 3 R.—**60.** כָּרְנָה] an orthogr. variation of מָדְוֵי (7[15]), cf. Gn. 47[3] (רֹעֶה): Ew. § 16[b].—**62.** בַּמְתֵי מעט] as 26[5].—**63.** ונסחתם] Pr. 2[22] 15[25] Ps. 52[7]; Ezr. 6[11] (Aram.), of a beam *pulled* out of a house†.

Digitized by Google

thee among the peoples] as 4^{27a} Jer. $9^{15(16)}$ Ez. 22^{15}; Lev. 26^{33}.—*From the one end of the earth, &c.*] as $13^{8(7)}$.—*And there thou shalt serve other gods . . . wood and stone*] v.[36] 4^{28}.—*Which thou hast not known, &c.*] $13^{7(6)b}$ (hence Jer. 19^{4} 44^{3}): cf. 28^{36}.—**65–67.** A powerful and graphic description of Israel's condition in exile: no peace or rest; never-ceasing anxiety and suspense; life in perpetual jeopardy: the present unendurable because fraught with peril, the future filled by the imagination with undefined terrors.—**65.** *Have no repose* (לא תרגיע)] Is. 34^{14} ("settle"). A rare word, only besides Jer. 31^{2} 47^{6} 50^{34} Is. 51^{4} (the cognate subst. Is. 28^{12}; Jer. 6^{16})†.—*Resting-place for the sole of thy foot*] Gn. 8^{9}.—*An agitated heart*] cf. the verb in 2^{25} 2 S. 19^{1} (AV. 18^{33} "much moved") Ex. 15^{14}.—*And failing of eyes* (כליון עינים)] in the vain expectation of relief. The eyes are said to "fail" when they long eagerly for something, especially if the longing be disappointed: comp. Jer. 14^{6} Job 11^{20} 17^{5} Lam. 2^{11} 4^{17} Ps. 69^{4} 119^{123}; and above, v.[32]. See also Lev. 26^{16} 1 S. 2^{33}, cited in the next note.—*And languishing of soul* (ודאבון נפש)] *i.e.* wasting away of life (on 12^{23}), through continued anxiety, or other cause: comp. Jer. 31^{25} (RV. "sorrowful"; rather *languishing*, viz. through want); Lev. 26^{16} "I will appoint terror over you, even consumption and fever, causing the eyes to fail, and the soul (life) to languish (מְכַלּוֹת עֵינַיִם וּמְדִיבוֹת נָפֶשׁ)"; 1 S. 2^{33}.—**66.** *Thy life shall hang in doubt before thee* (והיו חייך תלואים לך מנגד)] lit. "shall be hung up for thee in front," *i.e.* shall be, as it were, suspended in front of thee upon a thread, which threatens every moment to break.—*And thou shalt not believe in thy life*] *i.e.* shalt expect every moment to be thy last. The same phrase in Job 24^{22}, of a sick man, who has abandoned all hope of recovery.—**67.** *In the morning thou shalt say, Would it were even! and at even thou shalt say, Would it were morning!*] thus graphically is the agonized uncertainty, protracted by day and by night, depicted.—*For the fear of thine heart which thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see* (v.[34])] because of the imagined terrors of the future, and the actual perils of the present. Comp. for the

65. רַגָּז] only here.—**66.** לך] the dat. of reference (Ex. 10^{5} Jos. 2^{6} Jud. 16^{9} 2 S. 15^{30} 2 K. 4^{27} &c.).—מנגד] *in front*: Gn. 21^{16} 2 K. 3^{22} 4^{25}.

Digitized by Google

general thought, Lev. $26^{36f.}$ (groundless panics in the land of exile).—**68.** The final scene in the drama. The survivors will be brought back to the "house of bondage," which, as they had imagined, and as indeed Jehovah had purposed, they had left behind them for ever: they will offer themselves there as slaves, but even their enemies will dread to buy them; all men will shun them, as a people upon whom the curse of God visibly rests.—*In ships*] *i.e.* (probably) in slave-galleys. The idea is not that the surviving Israelites will be brought to Egypt merely as exiles, but that they will be brought there to be sold as slaves, the "ships" being those of the Phœnicians, who carried on a trade in slaves (Am. 1^{9} Ez. 27^{13} Joel 4^{6}), and had commercial relations with Egypt (Is. 23^{3}).—*By the way whereof I said, &c.*] cf. 17^{16}, with the note.

69 (XXIX. 1). Subscription to the Deuteronomic legislation (c. 5–26. 28).—*These are the words of the covenant, &c.*] the pron. *these* may point indifferently backwards or forwards (on 1^{1}); and it is disputed whether the verse refers to what has preceded, c. 5–26. 28, or to what follows, c. 29–30. The former view is that of Knob., Kuenen (*Hex.* § 7. 21, 2), Westphal, p. 104; the latter that of Ewald (*Hist.* i. 122), Keil, Dillm., Oettli. The former view appears to be the preferable one. The expression "*words* of the covenant" implies a specification of the terms or conditions to be observed by the contracting parties (cf. Ex. 34^{28} 2 K. $23^{2.3}$ Jer. $11^{3.6}$ 34^{18}); and it is said $29^{8(9)}$ that these "words" are to be observed; but no statement respecting what they comprise is to be found in c. 29–30; it is difficult therefore to understand how 28^{69} (29^{1}) can be intended as a superscription to c. 29–30. On the other hand, c. 5–26. 28 is occupied entirely with an exposition of the terms of the covenant: so that 28^{69} (29^{1}) would be an appropriate and natural subscription to it.—*In the land of Moab*] 1^{5}.—*Beside the covenant which he made with them at Ḥoreb* (1^{2})] the covenant made at Ḥoreb is alluded to in Dt. $5^{2.3}$; the covenant into which Israel has now entered in Moab ($26^{17f.}$; cf. $29^{11(12)}$), while in part identical with that, is largely an extension of it, embracing many entirely new regulations: the two covenants are accordingly distinguished.

Digitized by Google

XXIX.–XXX. *Moses' Third Discourse. Israel formally called upon to enter into the Deuteronomic Covenant.*

The Deuteronomic Code ends with c. 28. C. 29–30 is of the nature of a supplement, insisting afresh upon the fundamental principle of the Code, viz. devotion to Jehovah, and calling upon Israel to yield loyal allegiance to it. The discourse falls naturally into three parts. In the first, Moses, after referring to what Jehovah has done for Israel ($29^{1-8\,(2-9)}$), reminds them that the purpose for which they are now assembled together is that they may enter solemnly into covenant with Him, and warns them afresh of the disastrous consequences, including national ruin and exile, which a lapse into idolatry will inevitably entail ($29^{9-28\,(10-29)}$); in the second, imagining the threatened exile to have taken place, he promises that even then, if Israel sincerely repents, Jehovah will again receive it into His favour, and restore it to the land of promise (30^{1-10}); in the third, he sums up, in brief but forcible words, the two alternatives placed before Israel, life and happiness on the one side, death and misfortune on the other, and adjures the nation to choose wisely between them (30^{11-20}).

In these chapters, the connection is sometimes imperfect, esp. between 30^{1-10} and 30^{11-20} (see on 30^{11}); several words and phrases occur, not otherwise found in Dt. (Dillm. notes השכיל $29^{8\,(9)}$, אלה *oath, imprecation*, $29^{11.\,13.\,18.\,19.\,20\,(12.\,14.\,19.\,20.\,21)}$ 30^{7}, *idol-blocks* and *detestations* $29^{16\,(17)}$, פן יש $29^{17\,(18)}$, שרירות *stubbornness* $29^{18\,(19)}$, עשן אף and סלח $29^{19\,(20)}$, לרעה *unto evil* $29^{20\,(21)}$, תחלואים *sicknesses* $29^{21\,(22)}$, *forsake the covenant* $29^{24\,(25)}$, נתש *pluck up* $29^{27\,(28)}$, הדיח *drive away* $30^{1.\,4}$; and the phrases $29^{5\,(6)b.\,17\,(18)b.\,18\,(19)b}$); and the points of contact with Jeremiah are more numerous than usual. A question thus arises, whether the text is throughout in its original order, and whether it is entirely by the same hand as the body of Dt.: see the Introduction, § 4.

XXIX. 1–8 (2–9). Moses reminds the Israelites of all that Jehovah has wrought for them, from the time of their deliverance from Egypt, founding upon it a renewed exhortation to obey the words of the covenant.—The paragraph is a recapitulation of the substance of earlier parts of Dt., stated largely in the same phraseology.—**1 (2).** *And Moses called unto all Israel* (1^{1}), *and said unto them*] exactly as 5^{1}.—*Ye* (emph.) *have*

Digitized by Google

seen, &c.] cf. Jos. 23^{3} (D^{2}); also c. 11^{2-7}.—*All that Jehovah did, &c.*] cf. 1^{30} 4^{34b} 7^{18} $11^{3f.}$; also 3^{21} 4^{3}.—*Before your eyes*] 1^{30} 4^{34b}.—**2 (3)**. *The great provings, &c.*] 4^{34} (where see note), 7^{19}.—*Which thine eyes saw*] 4^{9} 7^{19} 10^{21}.—**3 (4)**. *But Jehovah hath not given you an heart to know, &c.*] the *heart* is named as the organ of understanding (on 4^{29}); *the eyes* and *the ears* are named as figures for the capacity of moral and spiritual perception (Is. 6^{10} 32^{3}). Israel's perverseness (cf. $9^{7.\ 24}$), the meaning must be, has obliged Jehovah hitherto to deal with it accordingly (Ps. $18^{27\,(26)}$), and to withhold from it the power of apprehending properly the duties which its relation to Jehovah had imposed upon it. Contrast the hope of $5^{26\,(29)}$, and the opposite action of Jehovah, after Israel's penitence, in 30^{6}. The remark is not very intimately connected with the context, and must be regarded as parenthetical: Israel's possession of the organ of physical sight (v.$^{2\,(3)}$) suggests the thought of its deficiency in the faculty of spiritual insight (comp. the same contrast, Jer. 5^{21} Is. 42^{20} 43^{8}).—**4–5 (5–6)**. The Divine guidance in the wilderness.—**4 (5)**. *And I led you forty years in the wilderness*] *verbatim* as Am. 2^{10}, and nearly as Dt. 8^{2}, cf. 2^{7}. From v.$^{5\,(6)b}$, it appears that the pronoun refers to God (see on 7^{4}).—*Your clothes have not worn away, &c.*] as 8^{4}.—**5 (6)**. Israel was not sustained by ordinary human food, in order that it might learn that Jehovah was its God, and that it was dependent upon Him for sustenance. The allusion is to the lesson of the manna, as taught in 8^{3} (where see note).—*In order that ye may know that I am Jehovah*] almost as Ex. 7^{17} $8^{18\,(22)b}$ in JE, Is. 45^{3}. The expression "And ye (thou, they, &c.) shall know that I am Jehovah" occurs in P, Ex. 6^{7} 7^{5} $14^{4.\ 8}$ 16^{12} 29^{46}, exceedingly often (more than 50 times) in Ezek. (*L.O.T.* p. 276 f.), and occasionally besides, as Ex. 10^{2} (JE) 1 K. $20^{13.\ 28}$. The form אני of the pers. pron., which is very unusual in Dt. (12^{30} phil. note), makes it probable that the phrase "to know that I am Jehovah" was already a current one, adopted by the Writer as one with which he was familiar: cf. *Journ. of Phil.* xi. 224.—**6–7 (7–8)**. The conquest of Siḥon and ʻOg, and the division of their territory; see $2^{32f.}$ $3^{1.\ 3.\ 8.\ 12f.}$.—*Unto this place*] 1^{31} 9^{7}

Digitized by Google

11^5.—**8 (9).** These benefits, received at Jehovah's hands, should constitute a motive to obedience: comp. $4^{34.40}$; $11^{3-7.8}$. —*Observe . . . and do*] 4^6.—*The words of this covenant*] 28^{69} (29^1).—*That ye may understand*—viz. so as to manage successfully (תשכילו)—*all that ye do*] 1 K. 2^{3b} (Deut.); cf. Jos. $1^{7.8}$ (D²).

9–12 (10–13). Israel is assembled here to-day for the purpose of entering formally into the covenant with Jehovah, and accepting the obligations which that involves.—*Ye are standing* (אַתֶּם נִצָּבִים)] more lit. *are stationed*, fixed, as it were, for a purpose—a more formal term than עֹמְדִים: cf. 1 S. $22^{6.7}$ Is. 3^{13}. With "before Jehovah," comp. "take your (their) stand (הִתְיַצְּבוּ) before Jehovah," 1 S. 10^{19} Jos. 24^1.—*Your tribes*] "tribes," in this connexion, between "heads" and "elders," can hardly be right. In all probability, "your judges" (שפטיכם) should be read for "your tribes" (שבטיכם): comp. Jos. 8^{33} 23^2 24^1. So prob. 𝔊 (for ἀρχίφυλοι appears to correspond to "heads" alone: see Jos. 21^1, and contrast c. 5^{23} 𝔊).—*Your officers* (שטריכם)] see on 1^{15}; and comp. 31^{28} Jos. 8^{33} 23^2 24^1.—(Even) *all the men of Israel*] summing up the whole, of which particular representative items have been previously specified, according to the usage in Dt. (p. 214).—**10 (11).** *Your little ones*] so 31^{12} Jos. 8^{35}.—*Thy stranger that is in the midst of thy camp*] Israel's "camp" (often in JE, and esp. in P) is not referred to elsewhere in Dt., except $2^{14f.}$. "Thy stranger," as 5^{14} 24^{14} 31^{12}. The mention of the "stranger" (cf. 31^{12}; Jos. 8^{35} D²) is an indication that the Writer lived in an age when the foreigners settled in Israel had acquired, religiously as well as socially, a recognised position (comp. on 10^{18} 14^{21}).—*The gatherer of thy* (fire-)*wood, &c.*] so Jos. $9^{21.23.27}$†, where the Gibeʿonites, after the fraud practised by them upon the Israelites, are condemned to serve in these capacities for the sanctuary (cf. Neh. $10^{35(34)}$ 13^{31}). But here, unless again the terms be borrowed from the institution of a later age, the reference may be to those performing these menial duties for the individual Israelites.—*Gatherer*] חטב is not connected with חצב *to hew*: the Arab. *ḥaṭab* is *fire-wood*, and *ḥaṭaba* is to *collect fire-*

XXIX. 10. מחניך] G-K. § 93. 3 R³.—חטב] 19^5 Jer. 46^{22} do not show that 'ח *means* to "hew": that it is used prop. of *fire-wood*, appears from Ez. 39^{10}.

Digitized by Google

wood (Lane, p. 593).—**11 (12).** *Pass over into his covenant*] see below.—*And into his oath*] or *imprecation* (אָלָה), *i.e.* a covenant sealed by an oath, and mutual imprecations (p. 67); so Gn. 26^{28} Ez. 17^{13} Neh. $10^{30\,(29)}$.—**12 (13).** *That he may establish thee* (28^{9}) *this day unto himself for a people, and that he may be unto thee for a God*] a succinct statement of the mutual obligations entered into by Jehovah and Israel. For the expressions used, see on $26^{17.\,18}$.—*As he spake unto thee* (1^{11}), *and as he sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob*] in Gn. $17^{7.\,8}$ (P) Jehovah promises "to be to Abraham for a God"; but there is no mention of a corresponding promise to Isaac or Jacob. But no doubt the reference is to passages such as Gn. $22^{16\text{-}18}$ 26^{24} $28^{13f.}$ (JE), the conditions involved tacitly in the promises there recorded being converted here into a formula expressing them distinctly. The oath to the forefathers is often alluded to in Dt. (on 1^{8}); but usually with reference to the promise of the land of Canaan: with reference to the covenant concluded with them, 4^{31} 7^{12} 8^{18}; cf. also 4^{37} 7^{8}.

13–20 (14–21). And the covenant is one which must be held to bind not only those present to-day, but future generations as well; for the danger of Israel's lapsing into idolatry is great; and the consequences are grave for him who yields to the temptation.—**14 (15).** *That standeth*] here the less formal word (עֹמֵד) is used.—*And also with him that is not here with us to-day*] *i.e.* the Israelite of future generations. Comp. the similarly expressed contrast in 5^{3}.—**15 (16).** *For ye* (emph.) *know how we dwelt, &c.*] the ground for v.$^{14\,(15)}$: for *ye* have experience of the idolatry rife both in Egypt, and among the other nations bordering on Canaan; and can judge consequently of the necessity of including future generations in the terms of the obligation.—*How we passed through the midst of the nations through which ye passed*] the *idem per idem* form of expression, explained on 1^{46}.—**16 (17).** *Their detestable things* (שִׁקּוּצֵיהֶם)] a

11. עבר בברית] a phrase found only here. Possibly it may have its origin in the ceremony of עבר בין הגזרים (Gn. 15^{10} Jer. $34^{18f.}$) in concluding a covenant: but more prob. it means simply "to *pass over* (Ex. $30^{13.\,14}$) *into* the covenant"; cf. the syn. *enter into*, Ez. 16^{8} Neh. 10^{30}.—**12.** . . . למען הקים והוא יהיה] G-K. § 114. 3 R[1]; Dr. § 118.—**14.** ישנו] G-K. § 100. 5.

Digitized by Google

contemptuous designation of heathen deities or idols, only here in the Hex., but frequent in writers of the age of Jer. and Ez., and sometimes subsequently, as 1 K. 11^{5} (Deut.) "Milcom, the *detestation* of the ʿAmmonites," ^{7} 2 K. $23^{13.24}$ Jer. 7^{30} Ez. $20^{7.8}$ Is. 66^{3} *al.* *Shiqqūṣ* occurs first in Hos. 9^{10} ("and became *detestations* like that which they loved"). It is cognate with the verb rendered *detest*, Dt. 7^{26} (see note). AV., RV. usually render "abomination," confusing it thereby with *toʿēbah*, except where it occurs by the side of this word, when "detestable thing" is adopted (Jer. 16^{18} Ez. 5^{11} 7^{20} $11^{18.21}$).—*And their idol-blocks* (גִּלּוּלֵיהֶם)] another contemptuous designation of heathen idols, found once besides in the Hex. (Lev. 26^{30}, H), used otherwise only by the compiler of Kings (1 K. 15^{12} 21^{26} 2 K. 17^{12} $21^{11.12}$ 23^{24}), by Ezek. (39 times: *e.g.* $6^{4.5.6.9}$; and parallel, as here, with *detestations*, $20^{7.8.18}$ 37^{23}; so 2 K. 23^{24}), and in Jer. 50^{2}.

The particular attribute belonging to an idol which the term expresses is, however, uncertain. *Gālal* is *to roll* (*e.g.* a stone, Gn. 29^{3}): hence Ges. supposed *gillūl* to denote properly *blocks* of stone, such as are rolled, the term being applied derisively to idols, as though *dei lapidei* (similarly Baudissin, *Sem. Rel.-gesch.* i. 95, but not limiting the material to stone, *cylindrical masses*, of whatever material): Ewald, on the other hand (*Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, ii. 264), thought it probable that the word was meant as a satirical allusion to the costume and appearance of an idol, and denoted properly *doll-images* ("Puppen, Wickelkinder").

Wood and stone] 4^{28} $28^{36.64}$.—*Silver and gold*] cf. 7^{25}.—*With them*] in their possession. Not *among them* (RV.).—**17-18 (18-19).** Take heed, therefore, lest there be any among you who yields to the temptation to follow the gods of these nations, and who is infatuated enough, when he hears the terms of the covenant, to imagine he may safely disregard them.—**17 (18).** (Take heed) *lest* . . .] this is the best construction (cf. Is. 36^{18} Job 32^{13}), with a period at the end of v.$^{16(17)}$; for v.$^{14(15)}$ (which looks distinctly to the *future*) can hardly be intended to make provision for a *present* need ("to-day," v.$^{17(18)}$).—*To go to serve*] cf. $13^{7.14(6.13)}$ 17^{3}.—*A root that beareth poison and wormwood*] a significant figure, ex-

17. לבבם פנה] 30^{17}.—סֵעָם] 1 K. 11^{9}.—**17-18.** פן יש . . . היה . . . התברך] חס 4^{16}: פן יש, as 2 K. 10^{23}.

Digitized by Google

pressive of the bitter consequences which idolatry brings in its train, the single hidden root being the source of abundant poisonous fruit. *Poison* (רֹאשׁ), as $32^{32.33}$ Hos. 10^4 Am. 6^{12} Jer. 8^{14} 9^{14} 23^{15} Lam. $3^{5.19}$ Ps. 69^{22} Job 20^{16}†. AV., RV usu. "hemlock" or "gall." It is evident, from this passage and Hos. 10^4, that some poisonous plant is denoted by the term; though what plant it is, is quite uncertain. As *rosh* means also "head," Ges. thought of poppies, of which several species are found in Palestine. *Wormwood* (לַעֲנָה), as Am. 5^7 6^{12} Jer. 9^{14} 23^{15} Lam. $3^{15.19}$ Pr. 5^4†.—**18 (19).** *When he heareth the words of this oath* (v.$^{11.13\,(12.14)}$)], *i.e.* the conditions of the covenant.—*That he bless himself in his heart, &c.*] *i.e.* mentally congratulate himself that he may nevertheless act as he pleases with impunity.—*Though I walk in the stubbornness* (שְׁרִירוּת) *of my heart*] *i.e.* persist in my self-chosen course of idolatry. Of course the expression represents the judgment of the Writer of Dt., not that of the imagined speaker (comp. "we have made lies our refuge," Is. 28^{15}). "Stubbornness" (lit. *firmness* [see below], in a bad sense), always followed by "of the heart," occurs elsewhere only in Jeremiah (3^{17} 7^{24} 9^{13} 11^8 13^{10} 16^{12} 18^{12} 23^{17}) and Ps. $81^{13\,(12)}$.—*To carry off the watered* (Is. 58^{11}) *with the dry*] or *thirsty* (Ez. 19^{13}); a proverbial expression, denoting *all* (comp. on 32^{36}). The two adjectives are *fem.* in the Heb.; and no doubt the reference is implicitly to herbage or plants; *watered* and *parched* alike, all will be swept away together. The clause is, of course, to be connected not with "though I walk," &c., but with "bless himself in his heart"; the meaning being that the idolater alluded to congratulates himself that he will escape all harm, *in order to destroy all together*, viz. through the deleterious consequences of his sin, which either (Knob.) brings down directly the Divine anger upon the entire people (cf. Nu. 16^{22} Jos. 6^{18} 7^1 $22^{18.20}$), or (Dillm.) spreads rapidly, and so infects the community at large as to produce in the end the same result The *result* of the idolater's action is represented, ironically, as being his *design* (לְמַעַן), as occasionally besides; comp. Hos.

18. שרירות] שרר (Pael), אשר (Af.), are common in Syr. in the sense of *confirm, strengthen*: and שְׁרִירוּת is *στερέωμα* (Col. 2^5).

Digitized by Google

8^4 Is. 44^9 Jer. 7^{19}.—*Carry off*] or *sweep away*: the Arab. *safā* is used esp. of wind *carrying away* dust. In AV. the fig. is lost: cf. Gn. $18^{23.24}$ $19^{15.17}$ (AV. *consume*); 1 S. 26^{10} 27^1 (*be carried away*: AV. *perish*); Ps. $40^{15(14)}$ *al.*—**19–20 (20–21).** Jehovah's anger against such a man will not be assuaged: He will mark him out amongst all his compatriots for an evil fate.—**19 (20).** *Will not be willing* (לֹא יֹאבֶה) *to pardon him*] AV. "will not pardon him" is inadequate: "will" is not here a mere sign of the future.—*And his jealousy*] *sc.* at the honour which is His due being rendered to another; comp. on 4^{24}.—*Shall smoke against that man*] Ps. 74^1 (of anger); cf. $80^{5(4)}$ (see RV. *m.*), Is. 65^5.—*All the imprecation* (אָלָה) *written in this book*] *i.e.* the curses (קְלָלוֹת) of $28^{15ff.}$; cf. 2 Ch. 34^{24}.—*Shall lie down upon him*] רָבַץ is *to lie down as an animal* (Gn. 49^9): if the word be correct, it must be used figuratively, of the curse *settling* upon him; but the metaphor is rather a forced one; and perhaps 𝔊 κολληθήσεται (*i.e.* וְדָבְקָה) *shall cleave to him* (so 𝔗) is the true reading (cf. $28^{21.60}$).—*Shall blot out his name from under heaven*] 9^{14}; cf. 25^{19}.—**20 (21).** *Shall separate him* (והבדילו)] 4^{41} 10^8 $19^{2.7}$; cf. 1 K. 8^{53} (in a good sense).—*Unto* (or *for*) *evil*] Am. 9^4 Jud. 2^{15} (Deut.), Jer. 21^{10} 24^9 29^{11} 38^4 39^{16} $44^{11.27.29}$ (with various verbs).—*Out of all the tribes of Israel*] 1 S. 2^{28} 1 K. 8^{16} 11^{32} 14^{21} 2 K. 21^7 (all Deut.): cf. Dt. 12^5 18^5.—*The imprecations* (אָלוֹת) *of the covenant, &c.*] $28^{15ff.}$.

21–27 (22–28). But the dreaded future will only too surely arrive; and the passer-by, when he sees the barren, depopulated land, and inquires the cause of its ruin, will be told in reply that it is a judgment upon Israel for its apostasy.—The tone is no longer deprecatory, as v.$^{17(18)}$, but predictive; for the dreaded contingency is now pictured as a certainty. The transition from the individual of v.$^{19-20(20-21)}$ to the nation in v.$^{21ff.(22ff.)}$ is somewhat abrupt; but the Writer evidently contemplates the case of the "poison" of v.$^{17(18)}$ having completed, only too thoroughly, its baneful effects.—**21–23 (22–24).**

20. הכתובה] as it stands, belongs strictly to הברית, though the part of "the covenant written in the book" specially referred to is, of course, c. 28. The versions express הכתובת (cf. 2 Ch. 34^{24}); and it is best to read either this or אָלֹת (sing., as v.^{19}).

Digitized by Google

Both the Israelite of a future generation, and the traveller journeying from distant parts, are imagined to put this question of surprise.—*The following generation*] Ps. $48^{14 (13)}$ $78^{4. 6}$ $102^{19 (18)}$.—**21 (22).** *Rise up*] Jud. 2^{10}.—*The foreigner that shall come from a far land*] hence (in a different connexion) 1 K. 8^{41} (Deut.).—*Plagues* (*stripes*)] $28^{59. 61}$ Jer. 19^{8}.—**22 (23).** *Brimstone and salt,* (even) *a burning, is all its land; it is not sown, &c.*] epexeg. of the "plagues," and "sicknesses" of v. $^{21 (22)}$; the soil is represented as covered with a sulphurous and saline deposit, mingled with calcined bituminous matter, checking all vegetation. For the figures, cf. Gn. 19^{24} Job 18^{15} Jer. 17^{6b}. The imagery (as the end of the v. shows) is drawn from the arid and barren tracts, bearing this character,—the effects probably of eruptions of bitumen,—in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea (cf. Tristram, *Land of Israel*, pp. 348–358; Dawson, *Egypt and Syria*, p. 124 ff.): the whole land is pictured as resembling these.—*Neither doth it cause to grow* (וְלֹא תַצְמִחַ: AV. *beareth*)] Gn. 3^{18} Is. 61^{11}; cf. Gn. 19^{25} "the *growth* (or *sprouting*) of the soil" (צֶמַח הָאֲדָמָה).—*Nor any herb cometh up therein*] *cometh up*, as Am. 7^{1} *al.*—*Like the overthrow of Sodom, &c.*] *mahpēkhah* is always used with reference to the cities of the Plain, either directly (Am. 4^{11} Is. 13^{19} Jer. 49^{18} 50^{40}), or allusively (Is. 1^{9})†: comp. הֲפֵכָה Gn. 19^{29}, and the cognate verb *hâphakh*, Gn. $19^{21. 25. 29}$ Jer. 20^{16} Lam. 4^{6}.—*Admah and Ẓeboim*] Hos. 11^{8}; Gn. 10^{19} $14^{2. 8}$†.—**23–24 (24–25).** *Wherefore hath Jehovah done thus to this land? And they shall say, Because they forsook, &c.*] almost the same words, borrowed hence, and merely accommodated to the city, or the temple, in 1 K. $9^{8f.}$ Jer. $22^{8f.}$ (cf. $16^{10f.}$).—*Forsook the covenant of Jehovah*] 1 K. $19^{10. 14}$ Jer. 22^{9} Dan. 11^{30}†.—*Which he made with them, &c.*] v.$^{13 (14)}$; also 1 K. 8^{21} (Deut.), Jer. 11^{4} 34^{13}.—**25 (26).** *Went and served other gods*] $13^{7. 14 (6. 13)}$ 17^{3}.—*Whom*

21–23. וראו carries on יקומו and יבא; ואמרו כל הגוים resumes ואמר הדור האחרון after the long intervening rel. clause (cf. on 4^{42}). Construe: "And the following generation will say—even your children who shall rise up after you, and the foreigner who shall come from a far land, and who shall see, &c. . . .—(23) Yea, all the nations shall say," &c.—מאחריכם] Eccl. 10^{14}.—תחלואים] Jer. 14^{18} 16^{4} Ps. 103^{3} 2 Ch. 21^{19}†.—**22.** ארצה] the suff. refers awkwardly to הארץ v.^{21}.

Digitized by Google

they knew not] 11^{28}.—*And whom he had not allotted unto them*] see on 4^{19}.—**26 (27).** *To bring upon it all the curse* (הקללה) *that is written in this book*] $28^{15ff.}$; cf. v.$^{19\text{-}20\,(20\text{-}21)}$ (אָלָה). Cf. Jer. 25^{13}. The clause is worded, like v.$^{18\,(19)}$, from the point of view of the Writer of Dt.; for "this book" is hardly appropriate in the mouth of the persons supposed to give the answer, v.$^{24\,(25)}$.—**27 (28).** *Plucked them up from off their land*] so 1 K. 14^{15} (Deut.), Jer. 12^{14} 2 Ch. 7^{20} (varied from "cut off" in 1 K. 9^{7}); Am. 9^{15} (with *not*). נתש (opp. to נטע *to plant*, Am. 9^{15} Jer. 24^{6} *al.*) does not occur elsewhere in the Hex.: it is not a very common word, being used chiefly by Jer. (1^{10} $12^{15.\,17}$ 18^{7} *al.*).—*In anger, and in fury, and in great wrath*] Jer. 21^{5} 32^{37}.—*Cast them into another land*] cf. Jer. 22^{26}.—*As at this day*] see on 2^{30}.—**28 (29).** *The secret things belong unto Jehovah our God; but the things that are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law*] by the "secret things," is meant the future: the knowledge of this, the Writer says, belongs to Jehovah; we and our descendants are concerned only with what He has revealed to us, viz. the practical duty of observing His law.—*All the words of this law*] 28^{58}.

XXX. 1–10. Nevertheless, if Israel in the land of its exile repents and turns sincerely to Jehovah, He will again visit it with His mercy, He will restore it to the land of promise, and bestow upon it again the tokens of His favour.—The paragraph (which may be regarded as an expansion of $4^{29\text{-}31}$) consists substantially of a reaffirmation of the promises given in previous parts of Dt., accommodated to the case of Israel's repentance in the land of its exile. V.^{11} (see note) seems to show, however, that it cannot have been originally designed to precede v.$^{11\text{-}20}$.—**1.** *When all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse*] the reference is to c. 28, where the blessings consequent upon obedience, and the curses incurred by disobedience, are successively enumerated. It is true, the

28. לנו ולבנינו] the *puncta extraordinaria* "have here no critical significance, but in all probability merely call attention, like the ל *majusc.* in v.^{27}, to some hidden meaning, which the Jewish doctors supposed to attach to the words in question" (Dillm.).

Digitized by Google

"blessing" might be deemed not strictly appropriate in a context which contemplates entirely the case of the nation's disobedience: but it seems that the Writer has in view Israel's future as a whole, which would not be throughout of a uniform character, but would present examples both of national obedience and of national apostasy; and the consequences of the former would afford material for salutary reflexion, not less than those of the latter.—*Which I have set before thee*] *i.e.* offered for thy choice (v.$^{15.\,19}$ 11^{26}): see on 4^{8}.—*And bethink thyself*] so 1 K. 8^{47} (AV.). Lit. *bring back to thy heart*, *i.e.* consider (viz. the causes of thy exile, thy relation to Jehovah, &c.): see 4^{39} (phil. n.).—*Hath driven thee*] הִדִּיחַ is common in this application in Jer. (8^{3} 16^{15} $23^{3.\,8}$ 24^{9} $27^{10.\,15}$ $29^{14.\,18}$ 32^{37} 46^{28}); so Ez. 4^{13}. Cf. נִדָּחֲךָ, v.^{4}.—**2.** *And shalt return even unto* (עַד) *Jehovah thy God, and hearken to his voice*] *verbatim* as 4^{30}.—*Which I command thee this day*] so v.$^{8.\,11}$: see on 4^{8}.—*With all thy heart and with all thy soul*] as 4^{29} (see note). The repentance must be thorough and sincere.—**3.** *Will turn thy captivity*] or *change thy fortune* (see below). Whether שְׁבוּת be derived from שָׁבָה or שׁוּב, the expression does not mean "*bring back* thy captives": it is used commonly with reference to a decisive *turn*, or change, in a people's fortune. Here, as also Jer. 29^{14} 30^{3} Ez. 29^{14}, the return from captivity is mentioned separately afterwards.—*Have compassion upon thee* (ורחמך)] $13^{18\,(17)}$; cf. 4^{31}. Comp. Jer. 12^{15} 33^{26} (כי אשוב את שבותם ורחמתים). —*And gather thee* (וקבצך)] Jer. 23^{3} 29^{14} (וקבצתי אתכם מכל הגוים ומכל המקומות אשר הדחתי אתכם שם), $31^{8.\,10}$ 32^{37}; and often in Ez. (as 11^{17} 36^{24}).—*Hath scattered thee*] 4^{27} 28^{64}; cf. Jer. 9^{15} 30^{11}. —**4–5.** However remote be the place of Israel's banishment,

XXX. 3. ושב את שבותך] by the older scholars this expression (which is a frequent one, as Am. 9^{14} Jer. 29^{14} $30^{3.\,18}$ 31^{23} 33^{26} $49^{6.\,39}$) was taken to mean *turn the captivity*—though with the admission that it might be used metaphorically (as Ez. 16^{53} Job 42^{10}); but Ewald, in 1841 (on Jer. 48^{47}; cf. *Jahrb. Bibl. Wiss.* v. 216 f.), called this expl. in question, contending that the meaning was to *turn a turning* (cf. 'ריב ריב פ, 'נקם נקם פ: שְׁבוּת from שׁוּב, like לְוִית from לוה), *i.e.* to *change decisively a person's* (or *nation's*) *fortune*; and most modern scholars have followed him (as Böttch. *Neue Ährenlese*, i. 65 f., *Lehrb.* § 464; Ols. pp. 412, 417; Kuenen, *Theol. Tijdschr.* 1873, pp. 519–524; Dillm. on Job 42^{10}; Nowack on Hos. 6^{11}; Cheyne and Kirkpatrick on Ps. 14^{7}).—**4.** נדחך] hence Neh. 1^{9}: cf. Jer. 30^{17} Mic. 4^{6}.

Digitized by Google

Jehovah will still bring it back, and visit it again with His bounty.—*The end of heaven*] in the far distant regions of the world, where, as the Hebrews supposed, the solid vault of heaven rested upon the earth: the same expression 4^{32} Ps. 19^{7} Is. 13^{5}, and (borrowed hence) Neh. 1^{9}. The more usual phrase is "the end of the earth."—**5.** *Do thee good*] 8^{16} 28^{63}.—*And multiply thee*] 7^{13} $13^{18(17)}$ 28^{63}.—**6.** He will, further, work in Israel a change of heart, that it may serve Him willingly, with all its powers.—*Will circumcise* (10^{16}) *thy heart*] *i.e.* remove its dulness of spiritual perception ($29^{3(4)}$), so that it may display again the activity and willingness of $5^{26(29)}$. The thought, as Dillm. remarks, is a Messianic one: cf. Jer. 31^{33} $32^{39f.}$ Ez. 11^{19} $36^{26f.}$.—*And . . . of thy seed*] v.^{19} $28^{46.59}$: cf. Is. 59^{21}.—*To love, &c.*] see 6^{5}.—*For thy life's sake*] a variation of the phrase usually employed, "that thou mayest (ye may) live," v.^{19} 4^{1} $5^{30(33)}$ 8^{1} 16^{20}; cf. 30^{16} (וחיית).—**7–10.** The curses resting upon Israel will then be transferred to its foes; and Israel will again enjoy the blessings of obedience in its own land.—*All these imprecations* (אָלוֹת)] as $29^{19f.(20f.)}$, with reference to $28^{15ff.}$.—**8.** *And thou*] the pron. is emphatic (opp. to the "enemies" of v.^{7}).—*And do all his commandments, &c.*] $28^{1.15}$: cf. 15^{5} 27^{1}.—**9.** *Will make thee have in excess . . . unto good*] repeated from 28^{11}.—*For he will again rejoice over thee for good, as he rejoiced over thy fathers*] cf. 28^{63}; Jer. 32^{41}.—**10.** *When thou hearkenest . . . , when thou turnest, &c.*] the condition of Jehovah's renewal of His favour repeated from v.$^{6.8}$, and introduced as in $28^{9.13}$ (repeated similarly from 28^{1}).—*Which are written in this book of the law*] $29^{20(21)}$.

11–20. No impracticable duty is laid upon Israel; Jehovah's demands are easy alike to ascertain and to understand. The moment is a crucial one: the path of life and the path of death lie in front of Israel; let it choose wisely between them. —The paragraph is loosely connected with v.$^{1-10}$. V.$^{11-14}$

10. הכתובה] the fem. sg., with a collective force, is construed often with plurals, when the pred. is a verb (G-K. § 145. 4), and sometimes even (if the text be always sound) with a pron. suff. (2 K. 3^{3} $13^{2.6.11}$ 17^{22} [but Klost. חטּאת: prob. rightly], 10^{26} [Klost. מצבת], Lam. 1^{13} [but see 𝔊, Löhr], Ez. 35^{10} [see versions, and Cornill], Ps. 145^{6} Kt. [read as Qrê, 𝔊𝔖𝔗], Job 14^{19} 39^{15}: cf. Ew. § 317^{a}); but these cases do not justify a fem. adj. in appos. with ס' הת': read prob. הכתובֹת (Jer. 51^{58} read חוֹמַת, as v.^{44} and 𝔊).

Digitized by Google

("For" . . .) clearly states the reason for a *present* duty; in view of the contents of the four verses, it is exceedingly unnatural to suppose (Keil, *Einl.* § 24. 3 *end*) that they explain why Israel should find it easy to return to Jehovah in the future contingency contemplated in v.^{10}. It is next to impossible, therefore, that v.$^{11-20}$ can have been originally the sequel of v.$^{1-10}$ (cf. the Introduction, § 4).—**11.** *For this commandment, which I command thee this day* (4^{8})] see 11^{22} 19^{9}; and on $5^{28(31)}$. The commandment meant, as 11^{22} 19^{9} show, is devotion to Jehovah, with the obligations which it involves, especially obedience to the moral and religious demands made by Him of His worshippers: this has been so emphatically and repeatedly insisted on in the preceding discourses that it may fitly be said to be well known, and "nigh" to the Israelite.—*It is not too difficult* (17^{8}) *for thee, neither is it far off*] it is nothing abstruse or incomprehensible, like the complicated structure of the human frame (Ps. 139^{6}: cf. 131^{1} Pr. 30^{18}); it is nothing recondite, which can be reached only by laborious and protracted study. The force of the expression *is not far off* is illustrated by the two figures employed in v.$^{12-13}$: *it is not in heaven*,—in an inaccessible height, which none can scale; *neither is it beyond the sea*,—in some distant region, which none can visit, for the purpose of fetching it thence, and bringing it to Israel's knowledge.—**14.** *But the word is very nigh to thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it*] it has been brought so near to thee—viz. by prophets and other teachers, and especially in the discourses of Dt.—that thou canst talk of it familiarly with thy lips (cf. 6^{7} 11^{19}), and meditate upon it in thy heart (cf. 6^{6} 11^{18}); thou art consequently placed in a position for giving it practical effect.—**15–20.** Finally, Moses earnestly exhorts Israel to make a right choice in the decision now devolving upon it.—**15.** *See* (1^{8}), *I have set before thee*—*i.e.* laid before thee for thy choice (11^{26})—*life and good, and death and evil*] comp. 11^{26-28}, where the alternatives are the blessing and the curse. On *life* in Dt., see on 4^{1}. *Good* (הַטּוֹב), i.e. *prosperity*, may be illustrated by 26^{11}, and the frequent use of the cognate verb in Dt. (4^{40} $5^{26(29).30(33)}$ $6^{3.18.24}$ 10^{13}); see also

Digitized by Google

Ps. 25^{13} (Heb. *abide in good*), $34^{11.13\,(10.12)}$ 103^{5} Job 21^{13} 22^{18} 30^{26}. With *death* and *evil*, comp. 4^{26} $8^{19f.}$. *Evil* (*i.e.* misfortune), as Jer. 7^{6} 25^{7} (Heb. "for evil to you") Ps. 10^{6} Pr. 13^{17}. See also Jer. 21^{8} "Behold, I set before you the way of life, and the way of death,"—the former being explained (v.^{9}) to mean desertion to the Chaldeans; the latter, remaining in Jerusalem.—**16–18.** Explanation of what is involved in the two alternatives: if the nation elects to obey Jehovah, life and happiness; if it elects to reject Him for false gods, disaster and ruin. The expressions as before in Dt.—**16.** [*If thou shalt hearken to the commandment of Jehovah thy God,*] *which I command thee this day, to love Jehovah thy God . . ., then thou shalt live and multiply, and Jehovah thy God shall bless thee, &c.*] the Heb. text appears here to be imperfect, though its imperfection is concealed from the English reader by וְחָיִיתָ being improperly rendered "*that thou mayest* live" (which would require here לְמַעַן תִּחְיֶה). By the restoration from 𝔊 of the clause in brackets the construction becomes perfectly regular, and the form of the verse corresponds exactly with that of the alternative case stated in v.$^{17f.}$ (so Di. Oe. Marti).—*The commandment, which I command thee this day, to love, &c.*] cf. v.^{11} 11^{22} 19^{9}.—*To walk in his ways*] 8^{6}.—*Live and multiply*] 8^{1}. —*Will bless thee*] 7^{13} 23^{20} 28^{8} *al.*—*In the land, &c.*] 7^{1} 23^{20} *al.* —**17.** *But if thine heart turn* (יפנה)] $29^{17\,(18)}$.—*But be drawn away* (וְנִדַּחְתָּ), *&c.*] 4^{19}.—**18.** *I declare* (26^{3}) *unto you this day that ye shall surely perish*] 4^{26a} 8^{19}.—*Ye shall not prolong days*] 4^{26b} &c.—*Upon the ground, whither, &c.*] 4^{26} 11^{31} 31^{13} 32^{47}.— **19–20.** Heaven and earth are called to witness that Israel has been fully informed of what is involved in the alternatives placed before it.—**19.** *I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day*] *verbatim* as 4^{26}.—*Life and death have I set before thee, the blessing and the curse*] a combination of v.^{15} and 11^{26}. —*That thou mayest live*] 4^{1} $5^{30\,(33)}$ 8^{1}.—*Thou and thy seed*] 30^{6}. —**20.** *To love Jehovah thy God, &c.*] 6^{5} 4^{30}.—*To cleave to him*] 10^{20} 11^{22} $13^{5\,(4)}$.—*For that is thy life, and the length of thy days*] to love Jehovah, and to follow Him faithfully, is the condition of thy life and prosperity. A variation in expression of the thought of $4^{1.40}$ &c.—*Which Jehovah sware, &c.*] 1^{8}.

Digitized by Google

XXXI.–XXXIV. *The closing Events of Moses' Life.*

With c. 30 the discourses of Dt. are brought to an end, and the narrative of the Pent. is resumed, for the purpose of recording Moses' final counsels to his people, and describing the circumstances of his death. The contents of the four chapters are somewhat miscellaneous, comprising, viz. :—

1. Moses' parting words of encouragement to the people and to Joshua, 31^{1-8}.
2. Instructions for the Deuteronomic law to be read publicly, once in seven years, before the assembled people, 31^{9-13}.
3. Commission of Joshua by Jehovah, $31^{14-15.\,23}$.
4. The Song of Moses (32^{1-43}), with accompanying introductory and concluding notices, $31^{16-22.\,24-30}$ 32^{44}.
5. Moses' final commendation of the Deuteronomic law to Israel, 32^{45-47}.
6. Jehovah's command to Moses to ascend Mount Nebo and there die, 32^{48-52}.
7. The Blessing of Moses, c. 33.
8. The narrative of Moses' death, c. 34.

The narrative contained in these chapters is not homogeneous; the same sources (JE and P) which are used in Gn.–Nu. here reappear, the nucleus being derived from JE, which, after it had been expanded by Deuteronomic additions, was subsequently combined with excerpts from P. The various parts of the narrative are not in all cases very closely connected together; on the question whether they are throughout preserved in their original order, see the Introduction, § 4.

XXXI. 1–8. Moses announces to the people, for the last time, that Joshua is to conduct them into Canaan, and encourages both them and him with the promise of Jehovah's support.—Cf. $1^{37f.}$ $3^{21f.\,28}$. The language used is repeated largely from earlier parts of Dt., esp. c. 1–3.—**1.** *And Moses went and spake these words to all Israel*] it is forced, and contrary to usage to refer "these words," with Kn. Ke., to what follows —in this case, "saying" (לאמר) instead of, or at least (Ex. 20^{1}) by the side of, "these words," would have been probably used: the expression can only be naturally understood of something which has preceded (cf. Gn. 20^{8} 44^{6} Nu. 14^{39}). The reference cannot, however, be to c. 29–30, for it has already

Digitized by Google

been expressly stated that this was spoken to all Israel ($29^{1(2)}$): the terms used imply that "words," previously addressed to Moses, are meant. The language of the verse (taken in connexion with what follows) would be best explained, if it could be supposed to have been once preceded by words such as those which now stand in $3^{27f.}$, appointing Joshua as Moses' successor, and bidding Moses encourage him (Dillm. Oettli). 𝔊 has *συνετέλεσε λαλῶν*, *i.e.* וַיְכַל לְדַבֵּר (32^{45}) for וילך וידבר, which is adopted by Klost. *Pent.* p. 134: this reading removes all difficulty; but the textual change which it implies is not a very probable one.—*Went*] viz. from the place where he was, when he received the command about to be reported to the people. "Disposed," or "set himself" (Kn. Ke.) is not a legitimate paraphrase, either here or Gn. 35^{22} Ex. 2^1 Jos. 9^4 Job 1^4 (which have been quoted in support of it).—*All Israel*] v.$^{7.11}$. The standing expression in the narrative parts of Dt.: see on 1^1.—**2.** *An hundred and twenty years old this day*] so (in P) 34^7.—*I can no more go out and come in*] *i.e.* am no more able to engage in active undertakings: cf. Jos. 14^{11}, and on 28^6.—*And Jehovah hath said unto me, Thou shalt not go over this Jordan*] 3^{27}; cf. 1^{37} $4^{21f.}$.—**3.** *Jehovah, thy God, he is going over before thee; he shall destroy, &c.*] cf. 9^3.—*Possess them*] 9^1.—*Joshua, he is going over before thee, as Jehovah hath spoken*] 3^{28}; cf. 1^{38}.—**4.** *As he did to Sihon, &c.*] $2^{32ff.}$ $3^{1ff.}$: cf. 3^{21b}.—**5.** *Deliver them up before you*] $7^{2.23}$: cf. 1^8 (phil. n.).—*According to all the commandment, &c.*] $7^{2.3.5}$ &c.—**6.** *Be ye courageous and strong*] so v.$^{7.23}$ Jos. $1^{6.7.9.18}$ 10^{25} (all D^2): cf. 3^{28}.—*Fear not, neither be affrighted before them* (ואל תערצו)] 1^{29}; cf. 20^3.—*For Jehovah thy God is he that goeth with thee*] 20^4.—*He will not drop thee* (4^{31}), *nor forsake thee*] v.^{8} Jos. 1^5 (D^2).—**7–8.** Encouragement of Joshua (cf. the injunction 3^{28}).—*In the sight of all Israel*] cf. 34^{12} Jos. 10^{12}; and see on 1^{30}.—*Be courageous and strong* (חזק ואמץ)] cf. 3^{28} "encourage and strengthen him" (חזקהו ואמצהו).—*For thou* (emph.) *shalt go with this people, &c.*] cf. 1^{38}. Sam. 𝔖𝔙, however, read "*bring* this people" (תביא for תבוא: cf. v.^{23}), which is adopted by Knob. Kuen. Klost. Dillm. Oettli, and is preferable in a connexion in which the stress

XXXI. 3. הוא עובר] 1 S. 1^{13} (Dr. § 199 *n.*).—**6.** הוא ההולך] v.^{8} 3^{22}.

rests upon Joshua as leader of the people, and not merely (as 1^{38}) on his being permitted personally to enter Canaan.—*Shalt cause them to inherit it*] 1^{38} 3^{28}.—8. *Is he that goeth before thee*] 1^{30}; cf. 1^{33}.—*He* (emph.) *will be with thee*] cf. on v.[23].—*He will not drop thee, &c.*] as v.[6] Jos. 1^{5} (AV. *fail thee*).—*Thou shalt not fear, nor be dismayed*] 1^{21} Jos. 8^{1} 10^{25} (D^2).

9–13. Moses gives instructions for the Deuteronomic law to be read publicly before the assembled people, once in every seven years, at the Feast of Booths in the year of Release.—9. *And Moses wrote this law*] cf. v.[24]. The brevity of the expression shows that the statement is made, not on its own account, but as the necessary preliminary to the injunction of v.[10-14] (Dillm.). Delitzsch supposes the reference, both here and 27^{3}, to be, not to Dt. as we have it, but to its kernel, the legal code of which the existing book is the parenetic expansion (*ZKWL.* 1880, p. 505; *Genesis*[5] (1887), pp. 23–25).—*And gave it unto the priests . . ., and unto all the elders of Israel*] *i.e.* he gave it to the joint representatives of the ecclesiastical and civil (19^{12}) authority in Israel, not so much for custody (see v.[25f.]), as in view of the purpose indicated in v.[10f.].—*The priests the sons of Levi* (21^{5})] *i.e.* the Levitical priests; see on 18^{1}.—*Which bare the ark of Jehovah's covenant*] cf. v.[25] Jos. 8^{33}; and see more fully the note on 10^{8}. The clause is manifestly intended to describe a standing privilege of the priests, not to state the fact that they were carrying the ark on this particular occasion.—10. *At the end of* (every) *seven years*] 15^{1}.—*The set time*] Ex. $23^{15} = 34^{18}$; cf. p. 189.—*The year of Release*] $15^{1ff.}$.—*In the Feast of Booths*] 16^{13-15}.—11. *When all Israel* (1^{1}) *cometh to appear in the presence of*] or, with the pointing לִרְאוֹת, *to see the face of*: see the note on 16^{16}.—*In the place which he shall choose*] as 16^{16}: see on 12^{5}.—*Thou shalt read*] Israel is addressed (as just before, in "thy God"), the command being supposed to be carried out by the particular members, or representatives of the nation, whom it may concern (cf. 17^{8}; and on 1^{21}): the address to Israel in the 2nd pers. is, however, a little incongruous by the side of the following "before all Israel," and perhaps the plural, "*ye* shall read" (תקראו), should be restored from 𝔊 ἀναγνώσεσθε (Dillm. Oettli).—*This law*]

Digitized by Google

i.e. as regularly (see on 1^{5}), the legislation of Deuteronomy.*
—**12–13.** All are to be assembled for the purpose, not the males only (who alone were under an obligation to attend the Feast of Booths, 16^{16}), but the women, the children, and the strangers, or foreigners resident in Israel,—the women because it concerns them, not less than the men, to know what the principles of Israel's religion are; the resident foreigner, because, enjoying the protection of Israel, and being in its midst, Israel's faith ought not to be a matter of indifference to him, and he should be instructed in the practical duties and responsibilities which his position lays upon him (cf. $29^{10\,(11)}$; and see on 10^{19} 14^{21}); and the children (cf. 6^{7} 11^{19}), in order that the rising generation may learn betimes the duties incumbent upon them.—*Assemble* (הקהל) *the people*] 4^{10}.—*Thy stranger that is within thy gates* (12^{12})] 5^{14} (Ex. 20^{10}), 14^{21}.—*That they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear Jehovah your God*] nearly as 4^{10} 14^{23b} 17^{19}.—*Observe to do*] 5^{1}.—*All the words of this law*] 17^{19} $27^{3.\,8}$ 28^{58} $29^{28\,(29)}$ 32^{46}; cf. 27^{26} 31^{24}.—**13.** *All the days that ye live upon the ground*] 4^{10} 12^{1}.—*Which ye are going over, &c.*] 4^{26} 32^{47}; cf. 30^{18}, also 4^{14} 6^{1b} $11^{8.\,11}$. With the importance attached to the instruction of children, comp. 4^{9} $6^{7.\,20\text{-}25}$ 11^{19} 32^{46}.

14–23. Moses and Joshua are commanded to present themselves at the Tent of Meeting, in order that Joshua may be appointed his successor, v.$^{14\text{-}15}$. Moses is there warned that after his death Israel will apostatize; and is directed to write the following Song ($32^{1\text{-}43}$), as a witness to future generations that the consequences of such apostasy have been foretold to them, v.$^{16\text{-}22}$. Joshua is instituted by Jehovah as Moses' successor, v.^{23}.—Here it is to observed that v.$^{14.\,15.\,23}$ belong together, all relating to Joshua, and v.^{23} being the manifest sequel of v.$^{14.\,15}$; v.$^{16\text{-}22}$ also belong together, but they relate to a different subject, viz. the Song. The entire section has been long recognized as not forming part of the work of D (Ewald,

* According to the Mishnah (*Soṭah*, vii. 8) it was the custom for a selection to be read, viz. Dt. 1^{1}–6^{3} $6^{4\text{-}6}$ $11^{13\text{ff.}}$ $14^{22\text{ff.}}$ $26^{12\text{ff.}}$ $17^{14\text{-}20}$, and the Blessings and the Curses (from c. 27–28). King Agrippa is mentioned as having read this selection.

Digitized by Google

Hist. i. 123; Knob.; Schrader, *Einl.* (1869), § 191. 3; Klost. *St. u. Krit.* 1871, p. 262 ff. (reprinted in *Der Pentateuch*, 1893, p. 236 ff.); Kleinert, p. 162; Wellh. *Comp.* p. 118; Kuen. *Hex.* §§ 7. 20; 8. 15; Dillm.; &c.). The grounds are best stated, perhaps, by Klost.

1. Phraseologically, the section contains many expressions which are not those of Dt., while several (esp. in $v.^{14.15.23}$) recur in JE:—

$V.^{14}$ קרבו ימיך למות: the same expression, Gn. 47^{29} (J), 1 K. 2^{1}†.

$V.^{14}$ התיצב *present oneself*, cf. Ex. 19^{17}, and esp. Nu. 11^{16b} (RV. "stand") Jos. 24^{1}. (The verb occurs in a different application, Dt. 7^{24} 9^{2} 11^{25}.)

$V.^{14.15}$ the references to the Tent of Meeting and the pillar of cloud are in the manner of JE, Ex. $33^{7.9.10}$ Nu. 11^{16b}, and esp. 12^{5}: the former is not elsewhere alluded to in Dt.

$V.^{16}$ הנה with the ptcp., of the fut., as often, both in JE (as Ex. 8^{17} 9^{18}) and Jud. Sam. Kings, &c., but never in Dt. שכב עם אבותיך, as Gn. 47^{30} (and elsewhere: see note).—*Go a whoring after*, as Ex. $34^{15.16}$ *al.* (see note): never in Dt., where "to *go after* other gods" is the phrase regularly employed (on 6^{14}).—*Foreign gods* (אלהי נכר): not in Dt. (see note).

$V.^{16.20}$ הפר ברית to *break a covenant*; not in Dt. (see note).

$V.^{17.17.18.22}$ *in that day*: though the expression is one that might be used by any writer, its repeated occurrence is not in the manner of D: it occurs otherwise twice only in the entire book, 21^{23} 27^{11}.

$V.^{18.20}$ פנה אל *turn to*: not elsewhere in Dt., where the phrase used is always *go after* or *serve*.—*Other gods*, though frequent in Dt., is found both in JE (Ex. 23^{17} 34^{14} Jos. $24^{2.16}$), and elsewhere (on 6^{14}).

$V.^{19.19.22.23}$ *children of Israel*; hardly ever, if at all, used by D (on 4^{44}), who regularly prefers *all Israel* (1^{1}), or twice, in exactly the same context as $v.^{23}$, says "this people" ($v.^{7}$ 3^{28}: in 1^{38} *Israel*).

$V.^{20}$ *which I sware, &c.* (so $v.^{21.23}$), and *flowing with milk and honey*, as often in Dt., but also in JE, and (rarely) elsewhere (cf. Jer. 32^{22}; and see on 1^{8} 6^{3}).—*Eat and be filled*, occurs besides in Dt. (on 6^{11}), but is not peculiar to it (*ib.*).—רשן *grow fat*, and נאץ *contemn* (see note), are not Deuteronomic.

$V.^{21}$ יצר *imagination*, Gn. 6^{5} 8^{21} (both J).—בטרם *before*: a common word (Gn. 27^{4} &c.); but not in Dt.

$V.^{17.18}$ *hide my face*, and $v.^{17.21}$ *evils and troubles*, do not occur elsewhere in the Hex.; *hide my face* and *evils* are perhaps suggested by $32^{20.23}$.

It is true, these are not all of equal weight; in the case of two or three, probably, there was no other occasion in Dt. for their use; nevertheless, taken in the aggregate their significance is considerable; and in view of the strongly marked style of Dt., it may be fairly concluded that a section in which so few of D's characteristic expressions are to be found, while so much occurs that he does not elsewhere use, is not his work. This con-

22

Digitized by Google

clusion, based in the first instance upon linguistic criteria alone, is confirmed by other indications.

2. V.$^{14-23}$ interrupts the connexion between v.$^{9-13}$ and v.$^{24-27}$. V.$^{24-27}$ is the sequel of v.$^{9-13}$: both deal with the same subject, the disposal of the Deut. law, and v.$^{24f.}$ is similarly worded to v.^{9}. A presumption thus arises that v.$^{14-23}$ is inserted where it now stands from a different source.

3. According to D, Joshua has been long nominated as Moses' successor (1$^{37f.}$ 3^{21}), and Moses has been instructed to "appoint" and "encourage" him (3^{28}); and 31$^{7-8}$ appears to describe how he has publicly ("in the sight of all Israel") done this. In 31$^{14.15.23}$, however, Joshua, having presented himself at the Tent of Meeting, is appointed to his office by Jehovah, and encouraged by Him (v.^{23}) nearly in the same words which Moses had used before in 31^{7}. These two representations do not properly harmonize: had both been written by one and the same hand, there is a presumption that the relation between the two ceremonies (v.$^{7f.}$ and v.$^{14.15.23}$) would have been more clearly indicated. As the narrative stands, it is evident that v.$^{14.15.23}$ is written without reference to v.$^{7f.}$, and does not presuppose it.

4. V.$^{16-22}$ is manifestly (see v.$^{19.22}$) the introduction to the Song in c. 32; and after the words "And wrote this song," &c., in v.^{22}, the Song would naturally be expected to follow at once. Instead of that, however, the Song and its introduction are separated from each other by v.$^{24-30}$, which, where it now stands, is also clearly intended (v.$^{28-30}$) as an introduction to the same Song. But two parallel introductions would hardly be written by one author. As v.$^{24-30}$ contains numerous marks of the Deuteronomic style, v.$^{16-22}$ may be presumed to be the work of a different hand.

It follows that v.$^{14-23}$ is not the work of the Deuteronomic author of the context in which it is now embedded (v.$^{1-13.24-30}$). V.$^{14-15.23}$ may be reasonably referred to JE. Whether, however, v.$^{16-22}$ (relating to the Song) belongs also to JE, is less certain: its literary character is less distinctly that of JE; it separates awkwardly v.$^{14-15}$ from its sequel in v.^{23} (cf. on v.^{23}), and may not impossibly have been inserted where it now stands subsequently (cf. Stade, *ZATW.* 1885, p. 298 f.).—**14–15.** Joshua is summoned to the Tent of Meeting, in order that he may be instituted as Moses' successor.—**14.** *Thy days approach for dying*] so Gn. 47^{29} (J), 1 K. 2^{1}†.—*Present yourselves* (והתיצבו)] lit. *take your stand*; so Nu. 11^{16} 23$^{3.15}$ Ex. 8^{16} 9^{13} 19^{17} 34^{5} Jos. 24^{1} (all JE), Jud. 20^{2} 1 S. 10^{19}. Cf. 29$^{9(10)}$.—*In the Tent of Meeting* (באהל מועד)] as often in Ex.–Nu., both JE (Ex. 33^{7} Nu. 11^{16} 12^{4}), and P (Ex. 27^{21} &c.). The meaning of the term is explained (by P) in Ex. 25^{22} 29^{42} 30^{36} as signifying the Tent in which Jehovah *met* Moses for the

Digitized by Google

purpose of speaking with him; it is thus practically equivalent to the *Tent of Revelation*. This and the next verse are the only places in Dt. in which the Tabernacle is mentioned.—*That I may command Joshua*] *i.e.* appoint him to his office. See on 3^{28}, where, however, *Moses* is instructed to "command" or "appoint" Joshua (cf. $31^{7f.}$).

There is a third representation in P. In P, Moses, at Jehovah's direction, has already solemnly "appointed" Joshua to his office, in the presence of Ele'azar the priest, and of the congregation (Nu. 27^{22-23}). The two passages are capable of a formal reconciliation, by the supposition that Dt. $31^{14f. 23}$ narrates Jehovah's confirmation of the appointment made previously by Moses. But, after the solemn manner in which, according to Nu. 27^{15-23}, Joshua's institution had taken place, such a confirmation would seem to be unnecessary; and even if the case were otherwise, it is singular that the terms of v.[14] (as of v.[23]) make no reference to any previous ceremony having been performed, but are worded exactly as if Joshua's first (and only) institution were being described. It can hardly be doubted that Dt. $31^{14f. 23}$ and Nu. 27^{15-23} are, in fact, two *parallel* accounts of the institution of Joshua, one belonging to JE and the other to P, which exhibit variations of detail, such as are often observable between the parallel narratives of JE and P.

15. *In a pillar of cloud*] so Nu. 12^{5}; cf. Ex. $33^{9. 10}$ (both JE).

16–22. Introduction to the Song (32^{1-43}).—**16–18.** The apostasy of Israel after Moses' death.—**16.** *Behold, thou art about to sleep with thy fathers*] "to sleep (lie down) with one's fathers," as Gn. 47^{30} (J), 2 S. 7^{12}, and constantly in the Books of Kings (1 K. 2^{10} 11^{43} &c.). P, for the same idea, uses the expression "be gathered to one's father's kin"; see on 32^{50} (of Moses).—*This people*] with a touch of disparagement, as Ex. $32^{9. 21}$ Nu. 14^{11} Is. 6^{9} 8^{11} 29^{13} *al.*—*Go a whoring after* (זנה אחרי)] so Ex. $34^{15. 16}$ (JE), Lev. 17^{7} 20^{5} (after Molech) Nu. 15^{39} (all H), Jud. 2^{17} $8^{27. 33}$: cf. "to go a whoring *away from* Jehovah," Hos. 1^{2} (מֵאַחֲרֵי), 4^{12} (מִתַּחַת), 9^{1} (מֵעַל), Ps. 73^{27} (מִן). The same verb (with the cognate substantives signifying *whoredom*) occurs elsewhere (esp. in Hos. Ez.) as a forcible figure denoting the disloyal abandonment of Jehovah for other gods. The origin of the usage is matter of conjecture. The words *may* have been employed in a purely figurative sense from the beginning: but in view of the fact that actual prostitution was not an uncommon feature in ancient Semitic cults (cf. on $23^{18(17)}$), it is not improbable that this suggested

Digitized by Google

the use of the expressions in question, and that originally they were meant literally, though afterwards they came to be used metaphorically. In particular passages, it is sometimes uncertain whether the reference is to a literal or to a spiritual whoredom: but elsewhere one, and not the other, appears clearly to be intended. Hosea (c. 1–3) conceives the moral union between Jehovah and His people under the figure of the marriage-bond (see W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, pp. 166–180); and from this point of view, any infidelity towards Jehovah would naturally be expressed under the figure here used. Nevertheless in Hos. 4^{12} (notice v.$^{13.14}$) it seems clear that the prophet has literal whoredom in his mind.—*The foreign gods of the land whither it goeth in, in its midst*] "in its midst" can only mean "in the people's midst" (to be taken closely with "the foreign gods of the land"); the pron. (which is masc.) being not referrible to "land," and the paraphrase (AV., RV.) "to be among them" being quite illegitimate. The sentence is, however, an awkward one; and Klost. (*Pent.* p. 239), with whom Dillm. agrees, may be right in thinking that originally it ran, "and go a whoring after foreign gods in its midst," *i.e.* the gods of the Canaanites living in Israel's midst (cf. Jos. 9^7 16^{10}; and esp. 24^{23} "put away the foreign gods which are *in your midst*"), the clause "of the land whither it goeth in" being a gloss inserted afterwards for the purpose of relieving the Mosaic age of any possible suspicion of idolatry.—*Foreign gods*] אֱלֹהֵי (הַ)נֵּכָר, as Gn. $35^{2.4}$ Jos. $24^{20.23}$ (all E), Jud. 10^{16} 1 S. 7^3 Jer. 5^{19} 2 Ch. 33^{15}†: cf. אֵל נֵכָר (poet.) Dt. 32^{12} Ps. 81^{10b} Mal. 2^{11}†, אֱלוֹהַּ נֵכָר Dan. 11^{39}†. Not the word rendered "strange" in 32^{16} Ps. 81^{10a} &c., but cognate with *nokhri* "foreigner" (14^{21} 15^3 17^{15} $29^{21(22)}$).—*Forsake me*] 28^{20} Jos. $24^{16.20}$ Jud. $2^{12.13}$ $10^{6.10.13}$ 1 S. 8^8 12^{10} 1 K. 9^9 *al.*—*Break my covenant which I have made with it*] הפר ברית, as v.^{20}. Elsewhere in the Hex. only Gn. 17^{14} (P), Lev. $26^{15.44}$ (H). The expression is, however, an ordinary one, Jud. 2^1 1 K. 15^{19} Jer.

16. אלהי נכר הארץ] אלהי נכר forms a compound idea, "gods of foreignness" = "foreign gods," which is then qualified by the gen. "of the land": cf. on 32^{16}.

Digitized by Google

11^{10} *al.*—**17.** *And mine anger shall be kindled against it . . ., and it shall be for devouring* (והיה לאכל),—*i.e.* for other nations to consume (7^{16}: cf. Nu. 14^{9}),—*and many evils and troubles* (1 S. 10^{19}) *will befall* (lit. *find*: v.^{21} 4^{30} Ex. 18^{8} Nu. 20^{14}) *it; and it will say in that day, Is it not because my God is not in my midst* (1^{42}) *that these evils have befallen me?*] the sing., as (in the Heb.) v.$^{16.18.20.21}$, of the people generally (on 1^{21}), which is represented as thus acknowledging the cause of its disasters. —*And I will forsake them*] corresponding to "they will forsake me," v.^{16}: the same antithesis, 2 Ch. 12^{5} 15^{2} 24^{20}.—*Hide my face*] *i.e.* withdraw my favour: so v.^{18}; perhaps suggested by 32^{20}. Not elsewhere in the Hex.: in other books, Is. 8^{17} Mic. 3^{4}, and frequently in later writers, esp. the Psalms.—*In my midst*] the sing., of the nation, as Jos. $9^{7.16}$ $17^{14.15}$ Jud. 20^{23} &c. (*L.O.T.* p. 366 f.). For the thought, cf. Ex. 17^{7} Nu. 14^{42} (whence c. 1^{42}), Mic. 3^{11} Jer. 14^{9}: see also on 1^{42} 6^{15}; and add Is. 12^{6} Zeph. $3^{15.17}$.—**18.** Jehovah will, however, still continue to withhold His favour from Israel: the acknowledgment, which the nation is represented as making in v.^{17}, is not the expression of true penitence.—*Turned* (פנה) *unto other gods*] v.^{20}: so Hos. 3^{1}: פנה אל also Lev. $19^{4.31}$ (H), Ps. 40^{5} *al.*—**19–22.** Injunction to write the following song ($32^{1ff.}$), in order that it may be a witness for Jehovah against the children of Israel.—**19.** *And now*] in view of the prospect of future apostasy, opened out in v.$^{16-18}$.—*Write you this song*] if the text be correct, Moses and Joshua will be addressed. In view of v.^{16} and esp. of v.^{22} ("And *Moses* wrote," &c.), it is considered by others that the original reading was sing., "Write thee." The plural agrees, however, with 32^{44}.—*And teach thou it, &c.*] cf. 2 S. 1^{18}. 𝔊𝔙 *teach ye it* (לַמְּדָהּ).—*Put it in their mouth*] cf. Ex. 4^{15}, and on 18^{18}. 𝔊𝔙 *put ye it* (שִׂימָהּ).—*A witness for me against the children of Israel*] viz. partly (cf. v.$^{20b-21}$) by showing them that, having been forewarned of the bitter consequences of apostasy, they have only themselves to blame if they suffer accordingly, partly (cf. 32^{6-18}) by convicting them of ingratitude in deserting their Benefactor, and

17. על כי] Jud. 3^{12} Jer. 4^{28} Mal. 2^{14} Ps. 139^{14}. על אשר (29^{24}) is more common.—**20.** כי אביאנו וג'] RV. "For *when* . . . *then* . . .": cf. on 8^{12-17} 12^{10-11}.

Digitized by Google

establishing the justice (32^{4}) and mercy (32^{34-43}) of God. Hence the Song is to be "taught" the Israelites, in order that their successive generations may become familiar with its contents, and take to heart the lessons which it contains. The idiom היה לעד ב', as v.[26] Mic. 1^{2} Jer. 42^{5}. The original aim of the Song, and the sense in which it was actually a "witness" against Israel, were possibly, however, different from those ascribed to it here by the author of 31^{16-22}: see p. 344 *top*, and on 32^{1}.—**20.** *For I shall bring it, &c.*] the pronouns, both here and in v.[21], are throughout sing., except in *serve* and *contemn.*—*Which I sware, &c.*] see p. 337.—*And it will eat, and be filled, and grow fat*] based on 32^{13-15}: cf. 6^{11} $8^{12f.}$.—*And will turn unto other gods*] v.[18]: cf. 6^{12} 8^{14}.—*And contemn me*] Nu. $14^{11.23}$ 16^{30} 2 S. 12^{14} Is. 1^{4} 5^{24}. Not elsewhere in Dt.—**21.** *Many evils, &c.*] v.[17].—*Will answer* (19^{18}) *before it for a witness*] cf. v.[19].—*For I know its imagination* (יֵצֶר), *which it* (the people) *worketh even now, &c.*] *i.e.* the thoughts and impulses working already in its heart, even before it has reached Canaan. Cf. for the thought, Nu. $11^{11.22}$ &c. יֵצֶר, as Gn. 6^{5} (hence 1 Ch. 28^{9} 29^{18}), 8^{21} (both J).—*Worketh*] lit. *maketh* (עשה), of the activity of the heart, as Is. 32^{6}.—*Which I sware*] "unto its fathers" (לאבותיו), as is added by 𝔊, Sam., seems needed: cf. 8^{1}.—**22.** *And taught it*] v.[19].

23. Conclusion of the narrative of Joshua's commission (v.[14f.]).—*And he commanded* (or *appointed*) *Joshua*] the verse seems once to have immediately followed v.[14f.] (from which it is now separated by v.[16-22], relating wholly to the Song). For, where it stands, the subj. of "commanded" can only naturally be Moses (see v.[22]); and yet, as v.[14] shows, it must really be Jehovah.—*Be courageous, &c.*] nearly as v.[7] (D). The verse (being the sequel of v.[14f.]) will originally have formed part of the narrative of JE. It may, to some extent, have been remodelled in the style of Dt.; but the only distinctively Deut. phrase in it is "Be courageous and strong": "children of Israel," as remarked on p. 337, is not Deuteronomic; and "the land which I sware" is said by JE as well as by D (*ib.*).—*And I* (emph.) *will be with thee*] hence Jos. 1^{5} 3^{7} (D^{2}): cf. Gn. 28^{15} 31^{3} Ex. 3^{12} (all JE), Jud. 6^{16}; also above, v.[8] (D) הוא יהיה עמך.

Digitized by Google

24–30. Moses gives directions for the Deuteronomic Code to be deposited beside the Ark. This done, he recites publicly, in the audience of the people, the following Song (32^{1-43}), forewarning the nation of the consequences, if it apostatizes.—The passage is throughout Deuteronomic; v.$^{24-27}$ forming manifestly the sequel of v.$^{9-13}$; and v.$^{28-30}$ consisting, as pointed out on p. 338, of a second Introduction to the Song: observe that v.^{28b} is parallel in substance to v.^{19}, and v.^{29} to v.$^{20-21}$.—**24.** *Had made an end of writing, &c.*] see v.^{9}.—*The words of this law*] *i.e.* of the Deuteronomic law (27^{26}): cf. on 1^{1}.—*Until they were finished* (עַד תֻּמָּם)] cf. v.^{30} 2^{15} Jos. 8^{24} 10^{20} (both D^{2}, and both after ויהי ככלות), 1 K. 14^{10}.—**25.** *The Levites, who bare the ark of Jehovah's covenant* (10^{8})] a comparison of v.^{9} and 17^{18b} shows that the reference is not to "Levites" in the sense of P (who were not permitted to enter the Holy of Holies), but to the members of the tribe officiating at the central sanctuary, *i.e.* to the Levitical *priests* (v.^{9}); see pp. 122, 219.—**26.** *This book of the law*] $29^{20\,(21)}$ 30^{10} Jos. 1^{8}.—*For a witness against thee*] viz. as presenting a standard of faith and action (cf. on 4^{45}), from which, in the case assumed, Israel will have visibly declined. It is remarkable that the same phrase which is applied in v.^{19} to the Song, is used here with reference to the Deut. law.—*Against thee*] *i.e.* Israel; the priests being addressed as the representatives of the nation.—**27.** *For I* (emph.)—*I*, who have experienced it so often—*know thy defiance* (מריך), *and thy stiff neck*] cf. $1^{26.\,43}$ $9^{7.\,23.\,24}$; and $9^{6.\,13}$ 10^{16}. —*Ye have been defiant with*] $9^{7.\,24}$.—**28–29.** The Deuteronomic parallel to v.$^{19-21}$.—**28.** *Assemble*] v.^{12} 4^{10}.—*The elders of your tribes and your officers*] cf. $29^{9\,(10)}$, also $5^{20\,(23)}$. The expression "elders of tribes" does not occur elsewhere. 𝔊 inserts "and your judges" before "and your officers": prob. rightly, for on such an occasion (cf. $29^{9\,(10)}$) the judges would hardly be omitted, when the subordinate *Shōṭerim* (1^{15}) were included.—*These words*] *i.e.* the Song 32^{1-43}, though the transition from v.$^{24-27}$ is somewhat abrupt. For another view (Dillm., Oettli, Westphal), according to which 31^{24-29} stood once before c. 29–30 (so that the appeal to heaven and earth of v.^{28} was the one in 30^{19}), see on 32^{45}, and the Introd. § 4.—*Call heaven*

Digitized by Google

and earth to witness] cf. 4^{26} 30^{19}. · Heaven and earth, having heard the warning (see 32^{1}) will be witnesses against Israel in the event of its disregarding it. It is doubtful, however, whether this is the original sense of the invocation in 32^{1}; see the note there.—**29.** *Deal corruptly* (תַּשְׁחִתוּן)] $4^{16.\,25}$: cf. שִׁחֵת 9^{12a} (Ex. 32^{7}), 32^{5}.—*Turn aside, &c.*] $9^{12b.\,16}$ (Ex. 32^{8}), 11^{28}.—*Evil will happen to you*] Jer. 44^{23}; cf. Gn. 49^{1}. *Happen* is קרא, not the word used in v.$^{17.\,21}$ (מצא).—*In the end of the days*] see on 4^{30}. Here the reference is to the distant, but undetermined, future, which the Writer pictures as the age of Israel's apostasy.—*That which is evil, &c.*] 4^{25}.—*To vex him with the work of your hands*] so 1 K. 16^{7} 2 K. 22^{17} (both Deut.), Jer. $25^{6.\,7}$ 32^{30}. Not definitely with idols (4^{28}), but with the systematic engagement in idolatrous practices, מעשה ידיכם = *enterprise* (on 2^{7}) being used in a bad sense, cf. Ps. 28^{4b} Lam. 3^{64} Jer. 25^{14}.—*Vex* (הכעים)] see on 4^{25}.—**30.** *All the assembly of Israel*] Lev. 16^{17} (P) Jos. 8^{35} (D^2) 1 K. $8^{14.\,22.\,55}$ (Deut.) 12^{3}†: cf. c. 5^{19}.

XXXII. 1–43. The Song of Moses.—The object of this poem is (v.$^{4-6}$) to exemplify the rectitude and faithfulness of Jehovah, as manifested in His dealings with a corrupt and ungrateful nation. With this aim in view, the poet, after the Exordium (v.$^{1-3}$), describes, *firstly*, the providence which had brought Israel safely through the wilderness, and planted it in a land blessed abundantly by Jehovah's goodness (v.$^{7-14}$); *secondly*, Israel's ingratitude and lapse into idolatry (v.$^{15-18}$), which had obliged Jehovah to threaten it (v.$^{19-25}$) with national disaster, and almost (v.$^{26f.}$) with national extinction; and *thirdly*, Jehovah's determination to grant His people victory over their foes, by speaking to them through the extremity of their need, and leading them thereby to a better mind (v.$^{28-43}$). The thought underlying the whole is thus the rescue of the people, by an act of grace, at the moment when annihilation seemed imminent. The poem begins reproachfully; but, in general, tenderness and pity prevail above severity, and towards the close the strain rises into one of positive encouragement and promise.

29. אחרי מותי כי] א׳ מ׳ is prefixed to כי for emph.: cf. Gn. 18^{20} Ps. 62^{11} 128^{2} Is. $28^{15.\,18}$ Mic. 5^{4} 1 K. 8^{37}; also 1 S. 20^{8b} Ps. 66^{18} 141^{10} Jer. 22^{15} Job 34^{31} Neh. 13^{27}.—וקראת] so Jer. 44^{23}: see G-K. § 74. 3. R.[1]

Digitized by Google

The Song shows great originality of form, being a presentation of prophetical thoughts in a poetical dress, on a scale which is without parallel in the OT. As the opening verses show, it is a *didactic poem*, taking the form of a retrospective survey of Israel's religious history, and developing the lessons deducible from it: in general plan, it resembles Ps. 78. 105. 106 (cf. in prose Ez. 20, and the allegories Ez. 16. 23), but the treatment is marked by greater completeness, and superior poetical power. The poet develops his theme with conspicuous literary and artistic skill: the images are diversified and expressive; and the parallelism is remarkably regular and forcible. A spirit of impassioned earnestness sustains and suffuses the whole.

Date of the Song.—The political condition of Israel at the time when the Song was written may be inferred without difficulty from its contents. Nothing in the poem points to Moses as the author. The period of the Exodus, and of the occupation of Canaan, lies in a distant past ($v.^{7-12}$), the story of which may be learnt by the poet's contemporaries from their *fathers* ($v.^{7}$); Israel is settled in Palestine ($v.^{13-14}$), and has had time not only to lapse into idolatry ($v.^{15-19}$), but even to have been brought in consequence to the verge of ruin ($v.^{20-30}$); it is hard pressed by heathen assailants ($v.^{30}$; cf. $v.^{21.\ 25-27}$), but Jehovah promises to interpose, and rescue His people from its foes ($v.^{34-43}$). Israel's apostasy, and consequent disasters, lie thus in the writer's past: all that is future is its deliverance. Such a situation, it is evident, is not that of the Mosaic age. To suppose that the poet adopted an *assumed* standpoint, especially one *between* Israel's disasters and its deliverance, is highly unnatural; $v.^{8-31}$ reads throughout like a piece of history; * the transition from the reproachful description of the past or present ($v.^{8-33}$) to the promise for the future ($v.^{34ff.}$) is analogous to similar transitions in the prophets (as Hos. $2^{14\,(16)ff.}$ Is. $1^{24ff.}$ Ez. $16^{60ff.}$ $20^{40ff.}$); and the poet, when he addresses his readers ($v.^{3.\ 6.\ 7}$), addresses evidently the guilty generation which has already, *after*

* The futures in $v.^{20-27}$ express obviously Jehovah's *past* determination, being introduced by the words, "And he said."

Digitized by Google

Israel's entry into Canaan (v.$^{13-14}$), lapsed from the faith of its fathers (v.$^{6-7. 15. 17d. 18}$). The post-Mosaic origin of the Song may be safely concluded upon this ground alone. It is confirmed by further indications. Both the line of thought and the phraseology of the poem point to an age much later than that of Moses: the theological ideas, the argument, the point of view, often also the expressions, display constantly points of contact with the writings of the canonical prophets, from the 8th cent. B.C. and onwards. The poem has accordingly been not inaptly characterized by Cornill (*Einl.* § 13. 5), as a "compendium of prophetical theology." Nor is the matured and regular poetical form (which is anything but "rugged"*) altogether what would be expected in a composition dating from the Mosaic age.

The *precise* date is, however, difficult to fix, the allusions to contemporary persons (see on v.^{21}) and events being (as often in the prophets) poetically indefinite. Former critics, referring the whole of 31$^{14-23}$ to JE, concluded that the poem was older than the composition of this work, the compiler of which, they supposed, finding the Song already attributed to Moses, incorporated it in his narrative, with an introductory and concluding notice, 31$^{16-22}$ 32^{44}. Upon this view, the political situation presupposed by the poem—Israel reduced to extremities by the successes of its foes, but its salvation resolved upon by Jehovah—would agree with the condition of Israel under Jehoash, or the early years of Jeroboʽam II. (*c.* 780 B.C.), when Israel, having been long harassed by the Syrians (1 K. 20 [cf. 22^{1}], 2 K. 5^{2} 6$^{8. 24ff.}$ 9$^{14f.}$ 10$^{32f.}$), and threatened under Jehoaḥaz with actual ruin (2 K. 13$^{3f. 7. 22. 25}$), began gradually to recover itself (2 K. 13^{25}, cf. v.$^{5. 14-19. 23}$; 14$^{25. 27}$): the crisis described in 2 K. 13^{23} 14$^{26f.}$ [cf. Dt. 32$^{36. 26}$] † would quite correspond to that which forms the turning-point in the Song. This is the period to which the Song is referred by Knob., Schrader (*Einl.* § 205^{h}), Dillm., Westphal (ii. 57 f.), Oettli

* *Speaker's Commentary*, i. 919.

† But the use in 2 K. 14^{26} of a phrase from Dt. 32^{36} does not show more than that the Deut. compiler of Kings deemed the expression a suitable one to denote Israel's condition at the time.

Digitized by Google

(p. 22). Ew., Kamp. (p. 302 f.), and Reuss (§ 226), understanding by the "no-people" the Assyrians, refer the poem to the years immediately preceding the fall of Samaria (B.C. 722). It is, however, a question whether either of these dates—the former of which would be earlier even than Amos and Hosea—accounts adequately for either the theological standpoint, or the literary characteristics, of the Song, and whether it would not be more properly assigned (cf. Kuen. *Hex.* § 13. 30) to the age of Jer. and Ez., *c.* 630 B.C. Though the literary individuality of the poet is strong, and there are consequently few *verbal* parallels, the general thought of the poem, and its predominant ideas, have decidedly greater affinities with the prophets of the Chaldæan age, than with the earlier prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, or Micah. The terms in which idolatry is reprobated, the thought of Israel's lapse, punishment, and subsequent restoration, various traits in v.$^{16. 21. 25. 35. 36. 41\text{-}42}$ (see the notes), the contrasts established between Jehovah and the gods of the nations, though there are isolated parallels in earlier prophets, recall strongly, as a whole, the tone and manner of Jer. Ez. and the Deuteronomic writers in the historical books. Where Israel's recent disasters are referred to (v.$^{20\text{-}30}$), or Jehovah's coming triumph is portrayed (v.$^{41\text{-}43}$), the terms used are figurative and general, and do not point necessarily to an author living in the age of Jehoash or Jerobo'am II.: as a prophetic meditation on the lessons to be deduced from Israel's national history, it would harmonize entirely with the spirit and point of view which prevailed (comp. Jer. $2^{4\text{-}28}$ Ez. 16. 20) in the age of Jer. and Ez. (cf. König, *Einl.* p. 224). And the literary analysis of the surrounding narrative shows (p. 337 f.) that, with its original introduction $31^{16\text{-}22}$, and conclusion 32^{44}, it might have been inserted in JE, after the narrative, as a whole, had been completed. The Song must, however, have been old enough to be currently attributed to Moses when $31^{16\text{-}22}$ was written,—unless, to be sure, like c. 33 (p. 388), it was from the first written *e persona Mosis*, and intended to fill the place of a (lost) parting song, in which Moses, according to tradition, had forewarned his people of the dangers of apostasy.

Digitized by Google

The literary parallels with other prophets are slight, the following being the most noticeable:—Hos. 5^{14b} 6^{1} (v.^{39}); 8^{14} (v.^{18}); 9^{10} 13^{5} (v.^{10}); 13^{4} (v.$^{12.39}$); 13^{6} (v.$^{15.18}$); $14^{10(9)}$ (v.^{4}): Is. 1^{2} (v.^{1}); 1^{4} $30^{1.9}$ *children* (v.^{20d}): Mic. $5^{6(7)}$ (v.^{2d}); 7^{17} (v.^{24d}): Jer. 2^{5} (v.$^{4c.21b}$); 2^{7} (v.$^{13-17}$ [general thought]); 2^{11} (v.^{21a}); 2^{20} (v.^{15}); $2^{27b.28}$ (v.$^{37f.}$); 2^{25} 3^{13} *strangers*, of false gods (v.^{16}); $3^{4.19}$ *father*, of God, cf. 2^{27} (v.$^{6.18}$); 4^{22} 5^{21} סכל *foolish* (v.^{6} [but נבל, not סכל], ^{28}); 6^{11} (v.^{25}); 6^{15} (v.^{35}); 8^{19} 14^{22} *vanities* (v.^{21}); 15^{14} 17^{4} (v.^{22}): add *vex* (with idolatry), v.$^{16.21}$, often in Dt., Jer., and compiler of Kings; and *abominations*, v.^{16}, sometimes in Jer., and frequently in Ez., of idolatrous practices. None of these are of a character enabling us to judge (even where a real imitation or reminiscence on one side or the other may be fairly assumed, —and in some other passages that have been quoted, this is yet more problematical) which is the original. And Jer., when he quotes earlier writers (*e.g.* Dt., or, in c. 48, Is. 15–16), quotes verbally and extensively: the fact that the resemblances with Dt. 32 are so few and slight makes it doubtful whether they are really reminiscences on his part from it. It is at least equally probable that Jer. and Dt. 32 are only connected indirectly; and that the resemblances (such as they are) are to be accounted for by the fact that the two authors lived in the same intellectual atmosphere, so that the same current expressions and ideas came to the lips of each.

Ἅπαξ εἰρημένα, occurring in the Song, are v.^{2} שעירם, v.^{5} פתלתל, v.^{10} ילל, בּוּן, v.^{15} כשה, v.^{18} שיה (but text dub.), v.^{20} אֵמֻן, v.^{24} מרירי, קֹטֶב, v.^{26} הפאה, v.^{34} כּמס, v.^{35} שִׁלֵּם, v.^{38} נסיך (נְסִיכָם; perh. text. error for נִסְכָּם), כתרה (if text be right). Uncommon words are v.^{2} ערף, v.^{7} the fem. pl. ימות, v.^{11} גוזל, v.^{14} חמר, v.^{15} ישורון, בעט, עבה, v.^{17} שדים, שער, v.^{24} לחם *eat*, קטב, זחל, v.^{27} נכר, v.^{31} פלילים, v.^{32} מרלת, v.^{35} עתיד, v.^{36} אזל, עצור ועזוב, v.^{42} פרעות. Of these the form ימות v.^{7}, חמר v.^{14}, שדים v.^{17}, עתיד v.^{35}, אזלת v.^{36}, have an Aramaic tinge.

The Song presents some noticeable affinities with the *Wisdom*-literature: notice the didactic tone of v.$^{1.2}$; also v.^{1} אֲמָרִים, v.^{2} לֶקַח, v.^{5} עִקֵּשׁ, v.^{20} תהפוכות, v.^{24} לָחֻם (see notes), and the emphasis laid upon the value of wise action, v.$^{6.28.29}$.

Words or expressions otherwise occurring chiefly, if not entirely, in writings not earlier than the age of Jer. and Ez. are v.^{4} עול, v.^{7} דור ודור, v.^{16} זרים (of strange gods), the pl. תועבות, הכעים, v.^{18} חולל, v.^{21} הבלים, v.^{22} קדח, להט, v.^{24} לָחֻם, רשף, v.^{27} נִכֵּר, v.^{33} אכזר, v.^{35} עתיד, v.^{36} אזלת, עצור ועזוב, v.^{42} שביה, v.^{43} the Hif. הרנין; and probably some others as well.

Monographs on the Song: Ewald in the *Jahrb. der Bibl. Wissenschaft*, viii. (1856) p. 41 ff.; Ad. Kamphausen, *Das Lied Moses*, 1862 (329 pp.); Aug. Klostermann in the *Stud. und Kritiken*, 1872, pp. 230 ff., 450 ff., reprinted in *Der Pentateuch* (1893), p. 267 ff.

1–3. Exordium. Heaven and earth are invited to attend, on account of the dignity and loftiness of the poet's theme.

Give ear, O heavens, and I will speak;
And let the earth hear the words of my mouth:
2 Let my teaching drop as the rain,
Let my speech distil as the dew;

Digitized by Google

As the small rain upon the young grass,
And as the showers upon the herb.
3 For I will proclaim the name of Jehovah:
Give ye greatness unto our God.

1. Heaven and earth are invoked, not as *witnesses* (4^{26} 30^{19} 31^{28}), but as forming an audience whose attention may be claimed on account of the solemnity and importance of the truths which the poet has to declare. Cf. Is. 1^{2} Ps. 50^{4} (each time before a great prophetic declaration); Mic. 1^{2} $6^{1f.}$ Is. 34^{1}. The sense attached in 31^{28} to the invocation—unless indeed (p. 347 *bottom*) the Song were composed from the first *e persona Mosis*—can hardly be that originally intended. The original aim of the poem (p. 345) was to point a moral from the past; but naturally, when it came to be regarded as a work of the Mosaic age, it was understood differently, as a warning for the future; accordingly, in 31^{19-21} the poem itself, and in 31^{28-29} heaven and earth invoked in v.^{1}, are treated as *witnessing* against Israel, in case it neglects the warning, and falls into misfortune.—**2.** The similes are chosen in view of the *moral* lessons which the poet desires to enforce. The *tertium comparationis* is manifestly the gentle, yet penetrating and effectual, action of rain or dew upon plants (Ps. 72^{6}). May what the poet has to say prove not less potent in its operation! may it be as the fertilizing rain or dew upon the hearts of those who hear it (Job $29^{22f.}$; Is. 55^{10})! may it give birth in Israel to a new spiritual life! *Teaching* (לֶקַח, properly *something received*) is a word otherwise peculiar to the Wisdom-literature (Pr. 1^{5} 4^{2} 7^{21} 9^{9} $16^{21.23}$ Job 11^{4}), and Is. 29^{24}†. *Young grass* (דֶּשֶׁא), as Gn. 1^{11} 2 S. 23^{4} *al.* Clause [d] (כרביבם עלי עשב), as Mic. 5^{6} (‖ כטל מאת יהוה). With the didactic tone of v.$^{1-2}$, comp. Pr. $4^{1-2.10}$ 5^{1-2} Ps. $49^{2-5(1-4)}$ 78^{1-2} (each a *didactic* Psalm).—**3.** The verse states the ground of the invocation, v.^{1}, and the wish expressed in v.^{2}: the poet will *proclaim Jehovah's*

XXXII. 1. אמרי] except Jos. 24^{27} (E), used exclusively in poetry,—48 times, of which 22 are in Proverbs and 11 in Job.—**2.** יערף] 33^{28}† (21^{4} *al.* in a different sense): cf. עריפיה Is. 5^{30}. Elsewhere (5 times) רעף (=Arab. *ra'afa*) is found in the same sense.—שעירים] not elsewhere.—אמרתי] only found in poetry (36 times, of which 19 are in Ps. 119): cf. Is. 28^{23} 32^{9}.—**3.** גֹּדֶל] of God, as 3^{24} 5^{21} 9^{26} 11^{2} Ps. 150^{2}.

Digitized by Google

name (cf. Ps. 22$^{23\,(22)}$), *i.e.* will declare openly, so that his people may recognize and own it, Jehovah's character, as revealed in His dealings with Israel (on 12^{5}; cf. Ex. 34^{5}, where almost the same phrase, ויקרא בשם יהוה, is followed by a solemn enunciation of Jehovah's moral attributes): let those who hear him respond in a becoming spirit, and *give*, *i.e.* ascribe (Ps. 29$^{1f.}$), *to* their *God* the *greatness* which is His due.

4–6. The poet's theme defined more closely: viz., to contrast the unchangeable rectitude and faithfulness of Jehovah with the corrupt and faithless behaviour of His people.

4 The Rock, his work is perfect;
For all his ways are judgment:
A God of faithfulness, and without iniquity;
Just and upright is he.
5 Corruptly has dealt towards him—not his sons are their blemish—
A twisted and crooked generation.
6 Is it Jehovah that ye treat thus?
O senseless people and unwise:
Is not he thy father, who ~~produced~~ acquired thee?
Did not *he* make thee and establish thee?

4. *The Rock* (הַצּוּר)] a title of Deity, recurring v.$^{15.\,18}$ ("the Rock that begat thee")$^{30.\,31.\,37}$; and found besides, 2 S. 23^{3} Is. 17^{10} 30^{29} (where "the Rock of Israel" forms an effective parallel to "the mountain of Jehovah") Hab. 1^{12}, and frequently in the Psalms (esp. צורי "my Rock"), as Ps. 18$^{3.\,32}$ ("Who is a rock except our God?" cf. 1 S. 2^{2} Is. 44^{8})^{47} 19^{15} 28^{1} *al.*: also in the proper names אליצור, צורישדי, פדהצור, צוריאל, Nu. 1$^{5.\,6.\,10}$ 3^{35} (all P). It designates Jehovah, by a forcible and expressive figure, as the unchangeable support or refuge of His servants; and is used with evident appropriateness, where the thought is of God's unvarying attitude towards His people. The figure is, no doubt, like *crag*, *stronghold*, *high place*, &c. (Ps. 18$^{3\,(2)}$), derived from the natural scenery of Palestine (for another view, see Cheyne on Ps. 18^{32}). In the Versions, the

4. הצור] the *casus pendens*, as Ps. 18^{31} &c. (Dr. § 197. 2; A. B. Davidson, *Heb. Syntax*, § 106^{b}).—משפט] a subst., the subject being (as oft. in Heb.) *identified* with the quality inhering in it (Dr. § 189. 2; Dav. § 29^{e}).—ואין עול] not "and *not* iniquity," negativing אמונה (which would be ולא עול: Jer. 2^{27}), but "*and there is no* iniquity" = *without* iniquity: cf. Jer. 5^{21} עם ככל ואין לב.—עול] 25^{16}.

Digitized by Google

metaphor is usually obliterated, the word being represented by *θεός*, *βοηθός*, *ἀντιλήπτωρ*, &c.—sometimes even *κτίστης*, *πλάστης*, as though from יצר; or *φύλαξ*, as if from נצר; *Deus*, *fortis*; חקיפא, תוקפי; &c. Hence in AV. *my strength*, Ps. 18^{2} 19^{15}; *God*, Is. 44^{8}. "'Great rock (or, mountain)' is a common title of Assur and Bel in Assyrian" (Cheyne on Ps. 18^{3}).—*His work is perfect* (תמים)] or (Reuss) *irreproachable*: His moral administration of the world (פֹּעַל, as Is. 5^{12} Ps. 28^{5}) is sound, free from מום or *blemish* (cf. on 17^{1} 18^{13}); it is not in any respect deficient, or justly open to censure. Israel's troubles (v.$^{22ff.}$) are not due to any failing or imperfection on God's part, but to its own delinquencies (v.$^{15ff.}$). Cf. the parallel in Ps. $18^{31(30)}$ האל תמים דרכו.—*Judgment*] or (in a forensic sense) *right* (Is. 61^{8}): the methods followed by Him in His rule of the world are just methods.—*A God of faithfulness, &c.*] He is *faithful*, *i.e.* true to His revealed character and to His promises (cf. 7^{9}), He is also *just and upright*. A concise and forcible declaration of the ethical perfection of God, maintained by Him uniformly, so the poet insists, in His moral government of the world.—**5.** With Jehovah's perfections, the poet now contrasts His people's sad deficiencies. The rend. of clause ^{a} is that of Oettli, who understands the second part as a denial of the title of Jehovah's true sons to those who, in fact, are but a "blemish" upon them, viz. the "twisted and crooked generation" of clause ^{b}. Oettli acknowledges, however, that the poem does not elsewhere distinguish between a true and a false Israel, and allows that the text is most probably corrupt. Clause ^{a} admits, in fact, of no satisfactory explanation. On other renderings and emendations which have been proposed, see below.—*Dealt corruptly*] 9^{12}.—*Sons* (or *children*)] as v.$^{6. 18. 19. 20}$ 14^{1}.

5. שחת לו לא בניו מומם] Kn. Ke. take דור וג׳ as the subj. of שחת, treating לא בניו מומם as in apposition to this, and parenthetically prefixed: "Corruptly has dealt towards him—not his children, their blemish [*i.e.* a blemish upon His true children]—a twisted and crooked generation"; but a construction such as this is too abrupt and forced to be attributed with probability to the original author (who, in his poem generally, writes with great smoothness and ease): the paraphrase in RV. (2nd marg.) conceals the harshness of the Heb. No better is the rend. of Kamp. (pointing

Digitized by Google

One of the many figures under which the relation of Jehovah to His people is expressed in the OT. The term is a significant one. Nations, or individuals, in antiquity often imagined themselves to be descended from a divine ancestor (cf. Nu. 21^{29}, where the Moabites are called *the sons and daughters of Kĕmôsh*): but in such cases the idea was a physical one; in Israel (in virtue of Jehovah's spiritual and ethical character) it is spiritualized; moral demands are based upon it; and it becomes the expression of correlative privileges and duties (cf. W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, p. 168 f.). The application of the idea may be illustrated by the following passages: (1) Jehovah loved Israel (cf. on 7^8), and therefore called him to be His son (Hos. 11^1), and the deliverance from Egypt stamped him as His firstborn (Ex. 4^{22} JE); the firstborn, thus delivered, receives from his Father a parent's education and fostering care, Hos. 11^{1-4} Dt. 8^5 Jer. 3^{19} (Render: "How (gladly) would I put thee among sons!"). But (2) this relation involves correlative duties, Dt. 14^1 (see note); to which, however (3) Israel often does not respond, and is reproached accordingly with its unfilial disposition (so here, v.[6. 18. 19. 20d] Hos. 11^2 Is. $1^{2.4}$ בנים משחיתים, 30^1 בנים סוררים, 30^9 בנים כחשים, Jer. $3^{14.22}$ בנים שובבים, 4^{22} בנים סכלים), and with disappointing its Father's expectations, Jer. 3^4 (words of unreal penitence: see v.[5] RV. *m.*), Is. 63^{8-10}. (4) The sonship of Israel is made the basis of promises for the future, Hos. 2^1 (1^{10}) "sons of the living God," Jer. 31^{20} (both of Ephraim). Cf. Is. 63^{16} $64^{7\,(8)}$, the appeal of the penitent nation to Jehovah, as its Father. The theocratic king, as head of the nation, is pre-eminently Jehovah's "son," though liable to correction at his Father's hands (2 S. 7^{14}, cf. Ps. $89^{26f.}$): he is described as "begotten" by Jehovah, on the day when he is installed into his kingly rights (Ps. 2^7).

A blemish] 17^1. Imperfect Israel is contrasted with Jehovah,

מוּמָם): "Corruptly has dealt towards him—not his children, blemishes [*i.e.* spots, disfiguring their Father, God]—a twisted and crooked generation." The versions render no help. Sam. 𝔊 have שחתו לא לו בני מום *ἡμάρτοσαν οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα μωμητά*, Sam. 𝔗 טבלו לא לה ברי ערברב (so 𝔖 חבלו ולא לה בניא דמומא; and prob. 𝔗 חבילו להון לא ליה בניא דפלחו לטעותא). The sense attached to the reading שחתו לא לו seems to have been "have done corruptly, (but) not towards him" (𝔗 "have corrupted themselves, not Him"), *i.e.* they may have injured themselves, but not Him, by their corruptions,—a strained and artificial sense. Aq. has *διέφθειραν αὐτῷ οὐχ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ. . . .*; Symm. *διέφθειραν πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐχ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ σύνολον* (? קָאוּקָה). שחתו לו לא בניו "his not-sons have dealt corruptly towards him" would not be out of harmony with Heb. idiom (see on v.[17]): but מומם remains an inexplicable redundancy. Ew. very ingeniously explained מומם from the Syr. מומתא *oath* (from Aram. ימא *to swear*)—"His not-sons have corrupted their oath towards him:" but the oath does not seem to be here in place; and the Aramaism is of a kind that cannot be said to be probable. Klost. proposes שִׁחֲתוּ לוֹ אֱמוּנָם (see v.[20] אֵמֻן, and Am. 1^{11}): restoring לא בניו (the omission of which does not seem to be necessary), we should then have "His not-sons have corrupted their faithfulness towards him." Dillm.: שחתו לו בניו מום בָּם, *i.e.* "His children have dealt corruptly towards him: there is a blemish in them" (whereas God's work is תמים: for מום בם, cf. Lev. 21^{21} 22^{25}).

Digitized by Google

whose work (v.^{4}) is תָּמִים. By *generation*, here and v.^{20}, are meant the poet's contemporaries, whom the term denotes, with the moral connotation which it sometimes acquires, as possessed of common ethical characteristics,—here (as Ps. 12^{8} 78^{8} Pr. $30^{11\cdot14}$) in a bad sense, sometimes (Ps. 14^{5} 24^{6}) in a good sense. *Twisted* (AV. *perverse*, which does not adequately express the sense of עִקֵּשׁ) is elsewhere found chiefly in the Proverbs: it is used in connexion with the heart, lips, mouth, and ways, and denotes a character which pursues devious and questionable courses for the purpose of compassing its ends; it is often, like its cognate verb, opposed to words denoting what is sincere, straightforward, and frank (תמים, ישר, and their cognates; see *e.g.* Pr. 10^{9} 11^{20} 19^{1} $28^{6.18}$; Job 9^{20} Mic. 3^{9} "and everything that is *straight*—viz. in a court of law—they *twist*"). פְּתַלְתֹּל *crooked* occurs only here; but the cogn. verb (or ptcp.) occurs Job 5^{13}, and (by the side of עִקֵּשׁ) Ps. 18^{27} Pr. 8^{8}.—**6.** Apostrophizing this crooked and degenerate nation, the poet, with some warmth, reproaches it with the folly and ingratitude of which it has been guilty: will ye thus—viz. with the disregard implied in v.^{5}—treat *Jehovah*, your Father and Benefactor?—*Senseless* (נָבָל)] *i.e.* obstinately insensible to the claims which Jehovah's goodness makes upon them (cf. on 22^{21}).—*Unwise*] in the Proverbs, wisdom, *i.e.* the faculty of shrewd observation, and acute, discriminating insight, is displayed as teaching and directing those who possess it in many different departments of human knowledge and enterprise, in the sphere of religion, not less than in those of

6. הל יְהוָה] so Van der Hooght, and other edd. For reasons which are obscure the reading here became early a matter of dispute; and MSS and edd. vary accordingly,—other texts having הַ לַיהוָה and others הַלַיהוָה. The true reading can, of course, be only הֲלַיהוָה (like וְלַיהוָה),—or rather (discarding the Mass. punct. of יהוה) הַלַיְהֹוָה. See *Lex.* p. 210; or more fully De Rossi, *Var. Lect. ad loc.*—הליהוה תגמלו ואת] "To *Jehovah* will ye do this?" The position of יהוה, immediately after ה, gives it emphasis. So הַלְאֵל Job 13^{7} 21^{22} 22^{2}; הַאוֹתִי Jer. 5^{22} 7^{19}; and analogously with other particles. גמל is merely *to do* or *act* (like πράττειν), 1 S. 24^{18} Ps. 137^{8} Happy he who repays to thee thy *doing* (גמולך), which thou hast *done* (גמלת) to us. So גמול ידים Jud. 9^{16} Is. 3^{11} "the *dealing* of the hands." גמל only sometimes acquires the sense of *requiting*, when the context suggests a comparison of the "doing" which the word properly denotes with antecedent conduct on the other side.

Digitized by Google

morals, politics, and social life generally. Here, accordingly, it is the part of a "wise" nation to be conscious of the moral superiority of Jehovah over other gods, and to perceive, on the one hand, the advantages which follow from consistent devotion to Him, and from observance of the laws which He has laid down for the welfare of nations; and, on the other, the disastrous consequences which the neglect of them must inevitably entail (cf. v.$^{28.29}$; also 4^{6}).—*Thy father, who produced thee, &c.*] in so far, namely, as by the redemption from Egypt Jehovah called Israel into being as a nation; and afterwards, with a parent's interest and care, watched over its growth, assisting the development of its powers, and training it to independence (cf. 8^{5}: also Hos. 11^{1-4} Is. 63^{16} 64^{7} Mal. 2^{10}).—*Produced thee* (קנך)] קנה is *to acquire*, usually by buying (Gen. 25^{10} and often), but also in other ways (Pr. 1^{5}), sometimes also *to possess* (Is. 1^{3}): used of a parent, or of God, as the author of existence, or moulder of the human frame, it may be rendered *get* (Gn. 4^{1}) or *produce* (Gn. $14^{19.22}$ Ps. 139^{13} Pr. 8^{22}).—*Make and establish* (or *confirm*)] *i.e.* fashion (into a nation), and consolidate: cf. Ps. 119^{73} (ידיך עשוני ויכוננוני); also v.^{15} (עשהו), Is. 44^{2} (עשך ויצרך מבטן).

7–14. Demonstration, from Israel's past, of the providential care which Jehovah had lavished upon His people.—The intention of these verses is to justify the reproach contained in v.^{6}. Let Israel reflect upon its past history, and consider (1) how Jehovah, when He fixed the boundaries of the nations, reserved a home amongst them for His people, v.$^{7-9}$; (2) how He led and sustained the infant nation in the wilderness, v.$^{10-12}$; (3) how He enabled it to take triumphant possession of the fertile soil of Canaan, v.$^{13-14}$.

7 Remember the days of old,
Consider the years of successive generations;
Ask thy father, and he will tell thee,
Thine elders, and they will say to thee:
8 "When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance,
"When he separated the sons of men,
"He fixed the borders of the peoples
"According to the number of the children of Israel.
9 "For Jehovah's portion is his people;
"Jacob is the lot of his inheritance.

Digitized by Google

7. *The days of old* (יְמוֹת עוֹלָם), as v.[8ff] show, are not the patriarchal age, but the period of the formation of the nation under Moses, and of its settlement in Canaan, cf. Is. 63[11] Mic. 7[14]. עולם, denoting *remote time* (whether past or future), is a relative term: Am. 9[11] it is used of the age of David; Is. 58[12] and 61[4] (in both parallel to דּוֹר וָדוֹר, as here) of the beginning of the Babylonian exile, viewed from its close. It is manifest from the context that those whom the poet addresses belong to an age which looks back upon the exodus, and the occupation of Canaan, as lying in a distant past.—*Successive generations*] on the Heb. idiom employed, see below.—*Ask*] 4[32] Job 8[8] 12[7]. The fathers, and elders, are to be appealed to, as the natural depositaries of historical information, in an age when knowledge of the past was largely handed down by oral tradition: comp. Job 8[8] 15[10] Ps. 78[2f.] Joel 1[8].—8. The answer of the "elders," extending (Ew.) to v.[14], or rather, probably, gliding insensibly into the poet's own discourse. When Jehovah allowed the various nations of the earth gradually to settle themselves in separate localities, He so determined their boundaries as to reserve among them a home for Israel, adequate to its numbers.—*Most High* (עליון)] a poetical title of God, Nu. 24[16] Is. 14[14] and in many Psalms (cf. Cheyne, *B. L.* p. 83 f.); perhaps suggested here by the thought of His supremacy over the nations of the world.—*Separated* (הפריד)] cf. נפרדו Gn. 10[32] (P).

The later Jews, interpreting the last words literally, and observing that just 70 nations are mentioned in Gn. 10 as descended from the three sons of Noah, imagined prosaically that a correspondence was intended between these nations and the 70 souls of Gn. 46[27]: so, for instance, Ps.-Jon.: "When the Most High gave the world for an inheritance to the nations which came forth from the sons of Noah, when He divided alphabets and tongues to the sons of men, he cast lots with the 70 angels, the princes of

---

7. ימות] the *fem.* plural, only once besides, Ps. 90[15]. It is more frequent (by the side of the masc. form) in Aramaic.—דר ודר] the ו has a distributive force, = "of *every* generation (see *Lex.* ו 1 **i.** *b*). Except in this phrase (which is frequent, though not otherwise earlier than Lam. 5[19] Is. 13[20] 34[17] 58[12] 60[15] 61[4]) it is exclusively a late usage, 1 Ch. 26[13] 28[14] Est. 1[8. 22] &c.—וְיַגֵּדְךָ] the jussive form before a *suffix* is found only once besides, Is. 35[4] (Dr. § 47 *n.*).—8. בְּהַנְחֵל] irreg. for בְּהַנְחִיל (cf. 26[12]): Ew. § 238[d]; Kön. i. 315; G-K. § 53 R.[2]—יַצֵּב] on this form, cf. Dr. § 174, with *Obs.*; Dav. p. 94. The original pronunciation will probably have been יַצֵּב.

Digitized by Google

the nations . . ., and established the borders of the peoples according to the number of the 70 souls of Israel which went down into Egypt." In clause d 𝔊 has κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ, *i.e.* "according to the number of the sons of *God*" (אל for ישראל), cf. Gn. $6^{2.4}$ Job 1^6 2^1 38^7. If this reading be original (so Cheyne, *Job and Sol.* p. 81; Cornill, *Einl.* p. 71; Schultz, *OT. Theol.* i. 227; Stade, *ZATW.* v. 300), it will be an anticipation of the later doctrine of guardian-angels, presiding over the different nations, found in Dan. $10^{13.20.21}$ 12^1 Sir. 17^{17}, and frequently alluded to in post-Biblical Jewish literature (see the extract just quoted, and Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, i. 806 ff.). The idea will then be that the nations were allotted to the care of subordinate divine beings (cf. 4^{19} $29^{25\,(26)}$), while Jehovah presided over Israel Himself (v.[9]). But the text yields a very suitable sense; and there is no sufficient reason for preferring this reading. Cf. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 294.

9. The verse states the reason why Jehovah showed the regard for Israel implied in v.[8]: when the territories of the nations were divided, Israel fell to Jehovah, and became His allotted portion. The thought is the same (though differently expressed) as 7^6 10^{15} &c. חֵלֶק is a *portion* or *share*, often, when applied to land, parallel, as here, with *inheritance* (*e.g.* Gn. 31^{14} Dt. 12^{12} 18^1); with חלק י׳, cf. Zech. $2^{16\,(12)}$. For "lot," lit. (measuring-) *line* (חֶבֶל), see phil. note on 3^4; and cf. כנען חבל נחלתם Ps. 105^{11}.

10–12. How Jehovah led and sustained the infant nation in the wilderness.

10 "He found him in a land that was a wilderness,
"And in the howling waste of a desert;
"He surrounded him, he cared for him,
"He kept him as the apple of his eye:
11 "Like a vulture, that stirreth up its nest,
"That hovereth over its young,
"He spread abroad his wings, he took him,
"He bare him upon his pinion:
12 "Jehovah alone did lead him;
"And no foreign god was with him.

10. The poet starts, not with the deliverance from Egypt, but with a situation better designed *ad exaggerandum Dei in eos beneficium* (Le Clerc), and to illustrate His providential care; Israel was *found* (cf. Hos. 9^{10}; and the figure of the exposed child in Ez. $16^{3\text{-}6}$) by Jehovah, at a time when it was homeless, and might readily have perished from want; it was tenderly taken charge of by Him, and brought to a land

Digitized by Google

abundantly provided for its needs (comp. Jer. $2^{6.7}$). The following clause depicts the perils of the wilderness,—its barren desolation, and the howling beasts which frequented it (cf. on 1^{19}). The word rendered *waste* (תֹּהוּ) implies a wild and desolate expanse (Job 12^{24} = Ps. 107^{40}; cf. Gn. 1^{2} Jer. 4^{23}).—*Surrounded him*] *i.e.* encircled him with His protection (cf. Ps. 32^{10}).—*As the pupil of his eye*] fig. of what is tenderest and dearest, and therefore guarded with most jealous care (cf. Ps. 17^{8} Pr. 7^{2}).—**11.** The eagle has in English poetry such noble associations that the substitution of "vulture" may seem a degradation of the figure which the Hebrew poet employs; but Tristram's argument (see on 14^{12}) that *nésher* is not the eagle, but the Griffon-vulture, seems irresistible; so that though *eagle* may be excusably retained in a popular version, it is a rendering without any pretensions to scientific exactness. The figure of Ex. 19^{4} (cf. Dt. 1^{31}) is here developed, so as to illustrate Jehovah's paternal affection shown in *training Israel to independence*: as the bird stirs up its nest, with

10. The impff. (so v.$^{11b. 12. 13. 16}$ &c.) reproduce the past with vividness, or (sometimes) express iteration (Dr. §§ 27*a*, 30; Dav. §45 R.^{2}).—בתהו ילל ישמן] lit. "in the waste of the howling of a desert" = "the howling (adj.) waste of a desert": cf. 31^{16} אלהי נכר הארץ, with note; Is. 2^{11} עיני גבהות אדם = the proud eyes of man; Jer. 8^{8} עט שקר סופרים = the lying pen of the scribes; Ps. 20^{7} בגבורות ישע ימינך = with the saving might of thy right-hand, 28^{8} מעוז ישועות משיחו; 2 S. 8^{10} 23^{1}. The disjunctive accent at תהו is no objection to this construction: see Jer. 8^{8} (and often). יְלֵל does not occur again; יללה is the *wail* of distress (Is. 15^{8} *al.*); but there does not seem to be any difficulty in supposing that (like *ululare*) the root was also capable of being applied to the cries of wild beasts. There is thus no need to question the integrity of the text; and the emendations that have been proposed (Klost.; Dillm.) do not commend themselves as improvements. Ps.-Jon., with substantial correctness: אתר דמיללין שדין וירודין [*not* ירודין, which is a corruption: v. Fleischer, *ap.* Levy, *NHWB.* ii. p. 446, and Payne Smith, col. 1630].—יבוננהו] the *Polel*, *to bestow* (mental) *attention on*, occurs only here. The more common Hithp. התבונן has a refl. force, *to consider for oneself.*—כאישון עינו] cf. Pr. 7^{2}; כאישון בת עין Ps. 17^{8}: also (fig. of the *midst* of darkness) Pr. 7^{9} 20^{20}†. The -*on* has prob. the force of a diminutive: cf. in Syriac מלכונא *regulus*, כתבונא *little book*, &c. (Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.* p. 73); and Stade, § 296^{c}, who adds שַׂהֲרֹנִים *little moons* or *crescents* (Jud. 8^{21}), וַרְעֹנִים, and perhaps שְׁפִיפֹן, and צַוְּרֹן Cant. 4^{9}.—**11.** כנשר יעיר] "like a vulture (that) stirreth up," &c. This is always the constr. when כ with a subst. is followed by a verb (for כ is not a *conj.*, like כאשר): so *e.g.* Is. $61^{10f.}$ (4 examples) כחתן יכהן פאר like a bridegroom, (who) &c., 62^{1} כלפיד יבער like

Digitized by Google

the object of encouraging its young ones to flight, but at the same time hovers over them so as to be at hand to support them on its wings, in case their strength fails and they are in danger of falling, so Jehovah (the figure of the bird being still retained) spread out His wings, and bare Israel upon them, until its powers were matured, and the nation was able to support itself alone (cf. Hos. 11^{3}).

W. L. Alexander quotes from Davy, *Salmonia*, p. 87, the following pertinent illustration: "Two parent eagles on Ben Weevis were teaching their offspring, two young birds, the manœuvres of flight." Rising from the top of a mountain, they "at first made small circles and the young imitated them; they paused on their wings waiting till they had made their first flight, holding them on their expanded wings when they appeared exhausted, and then took a second and larger gyration, always rising towards the sun, and enlarging their circle of flight, so as to make a gradually ascending spiral." See also Bochart, *Hierozoicon*, ii. 181.

12. Jehovah led Israel without the aid of other gods: the more groundless and ungrateful therefore was the nation's subsequent desertion of Him, v.$^{16-18}$. *Foreign god* (אֵל נֵכָר), as Ps. $81^{10\,(9)b}$ Mal. 2^{11} (not "*strange* god" = אֵל זָר), cf. on 31^{16}: for the thought, comp. Hos. 13^{4} (RV. *m.*) Is. 43^{12}. In thus sustaining Israel through the desert, Jehovah was, in fact, *leading* him (Ex. 13^{21} 15^{13}) to his home: He was, moreover, doing this *alone*, without the co-operation of any other god.

13–14. How Israel was enabled to take possession of the fertile soil of Canaan.

13 "He made him ride on the high-places of the land,
"And he ate the fruitage of the field;
"And he made him suck honey out of the crag,
"And oil from the rocky flint:

---

a lamp (that) burneth, Ps. 42^{2} כאיל תערג וג׳, 83^{15}, and frequently. The impf. states picturesquely the *tertium comparationis* (Dr. § 34; Dav. § 44 R.[3]).—גוזליו] Gn. 15^{9}†.—ירחף] cf. Gn. 1^{2}. In Syriac the word means to *hover* or *brood over*: Wright, *Apocr. Acts of Apostles*, 49, l. 15 (of angels hovering over the Virgin), Ephr. Syr. i. 117 E–118 A (of the Spirit of God *brooding over*, and fertilizing, the waters, like a hen דמרחפא על בנתא); cf. ii. 29 F the adv. מרחפנאית *in hovering attitude*, of the Seraphim above the throne (Is. 6^{2}).—**12.** בדד] an adv. accus., *with isolation* (Jer. 15^{17} *al.*; Dav. § 70 R.[2]); here = *alone*, though this, when it means "to the exclusion of others," is elsewhere always expressed in Heb. by לְבַדּוֹ (לְבַדְּךָ &c.), lit. "according to his (thy, &c.) separation," Gn. 32^{17} &c.—**13.** במתי] Kt. is בָּמוֹתֵי, the Qrê בָּמֳתֵי. So elsewhere. The ׳ is very anomalous: see Stade, § 330^{b}, G-K. § 87. 5 R.[1]—שָׂדָי] pausal form of שָׂדַי, the older form of שָׂדֶה (cf. גֹּלָה for *gōlay*, &c.), retained in poetry (13 times), *e.g.* Ps. 8^{8}.

Digitized by Google

14 " Curd of kine, and milk of sheep,
" With fat of lambs, and rams;
" Herds of Bashan, and he-goats,
" With the kidney-fat of wheat:
" And the blood of the grape thou didst drink as foaming wine."

13. In clause [a] the poet uses a fine imaginative figure, implying triumphant and undisputed possession; similarly 33^{29} (תדרך), Hab. 3^{19} (ידריכני), Ps. 18^{34} (יעמידני); and of God, marching as sovereign over the earth, Am. 4^{13} Mic. 1^{3}, or sea, Job 9^{8} (in all דָּרַךְ). This passage suggests the terms of the promise in Is. 58^{14}.—*And he ate* (ויאכל)] Sam. 𝔊𝔖 וַיַּאֲכִלֵהוּ *and made him eat*, which is preferred by Klost. and Marti (in Kautzsch's *Heil. Schriften des AT.s*), and may be right (though the reminiscences in Is. 58^{14b} Ps. $81^{17(16)}$ hardly *prove* that the authors of these passages so read it): at the same time, it is quite possible that ויאכל may have been chosen purposely for variety. —*Fruitage of the field* (תנובת שדי)] exactly so Lam. 4^{9} (as the support of life); cf. תנובת השדה Ez. 38^{30} (‖ *fruit of the tree*): תנובה also Jud. 9^{11} (of the fig) Is. 27^{6}†: cf. the verb, Pr. 10^{31} Ps. 92^{15}.—*Honey out of the crag, &c.*] even places that might be expected to be naturally barren yielded rich and valued products, which Israel might *suck*—*i.e.* enjoy with relish (33^{19} Is. 60^{16} $66^{11.12}$)—in its Palestinian home. Palestine, says Tristram (*DB.*^{2} i. 377), is by its flora well suited to bees; and in the wadys "innumerable caves and fissures of the dry limestone rocks afford shelter and protection for the combs." Hence honey might literally be found oozing out from among the rocks. The olive also flourishes in sandy, and even in rocky soil (cf. Job 29^{6}).—*Rocky flint*] cf. 8^{15} (flinty rock).—**14.** The poet eloquently continues his enumeration of the choice and varied products of Palestine—the flocks and herds which fattened upon its pastures, and the vines which clothed its hillsides with purple crops. חמאה is not "butter," but *curdled* or *sour milk*, still esteemed in the East as a refreshing beverage, and often offered to travellers. It is now called *leben* (*DB. s.v.* MILK). Comp. Gn. 18^{8} Jud. 5^{25} 2 S. 17^{29} Job 20^{17} 29^{6}. The second line of the verse ends better with *rams* (Ew.

14. בני בשן] בני poet. for *offspring, produce*: cf. of animals בני בקר 1 S. 14^{32} *al.*; Ps. 29^{6} $114^{4.6}$.

Digitized by Google

Klost. Dillm. Oettli, with 𝔊, Heb. MSS., and Edd.: cf. Norzi *ad loc.*) than with *lambs*: *the fat of rams*, as 1 S. 15^{22}, cf. Is. 34^{6}. כרים is not the usual term for "lambs"; it seems to denote such as, from their age or kind, were a special delicacy: cf. 1 S. 15^{9} Am. 6^{4}. The combination כרים, אילים, and עתודים, recurs Ez. 27^{21} 39^{18}, and Is. 34^{6}.—*Herds of Bashan*] celebrated for their strength and size (cf. on 3^{1}). *Fat*, fig. of what is best or finest, occurs Nu. 18^{12} (the "fat" of oil and of new wine), and in the phrase "fat of wheat," Ps. $81^{17(16)}$ (doubtless a reminiscence from this passage) 147^{14}: the fat about the kidneys being the richest (cf. Lev. 3^{4}; Is. 34^{6} "kidney-fat of rams"), the "kidney-fat of wheat" denotes the choicest and most nutritious wheat.—*Blood of the grape*] from Gn. 49^{11}. —*Foaming wine*] not יַיִן, the usual word, but חֶמֶר, common in Aram. and Arab. (*chamr*, from *chamara*, *to ferment*), but in Heb. found only in poetry, here and Is. 27^{2} (where, however, very probably חֶמֶד *pleasantness* should be read: see RV. *marg.*). Perhaps in Heb. the proper sense of the word, *fermenting* or *foaming draught* (Ps. 75^{7}), was still felt, and it had not sunk to be a mere synonym of יין. The change to the 2nd pers. ("*thou* didst drink") is such as often occurs in Heb. poetry; here its effect is to bring vividly home to Israel the truth of what is said (cf. v.$^{15.18}$).

15–18. Israel's ingratitude and defection from Jehovah, the result of the abundance of good things which it enjoyed.

15 But Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked:
Thou waxedst fat, thou grewest thick, thou wast gorged with food!
And he forsook God which made him,
And treated as senseless the Rock of his salvation.
16 They made him jealous with strange (gods):
With abominations they vexed him.
17 They sacrificed unto Shêdim, (to) a no-god,
(To) gods whom they knew not,
To new (gods) that came in of late,
Before whom your fathers shuddered not.
18 Of the Rock that begat thee, thou wast unmindful;
And thou forgattest God that travailed with thee.

15. Before this verse Sam. 𝔊 have ויאכל יעקב וישבע (καὶ ἔφαγεν Ἰακωβ καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη), which connects well with v.^{14}, and, as it seems to him to be quoted in 31^{20} Neh. 9^{25}, is accepted by

Klo. (and, less confidently, by Dillm.) as an original part of the text. But the phrases in 31^{20} Neh. 9^{25} do not necessarily presuppose such a clause here; and its addition makes v.^{15} long and heavy.—*Jeshurun*] a poetical title of Israel, "pointing allusively to יִשְׂרָאֵל, but derived from יָשָׁר *upright*" (Dillm.), and accordingly designating the nation under its ideal character (cf. Ex. 19^{6} Dt. 14^{2} &c.), as the *Upright one* (Aq. Θ.Σ. εὐθύτατος; hence 𝔙 *rectissimus*): here, where the context is of declension from its ideal, applied to it reproachfully. "Nomen Recti pro Israele ponens, ironice eos perstringit qui a rectitudine defecerant" (Calv.). Elsewhere (33$^{5.26}$ Is. 44^{2}†) it is used as a title of honour.—*Waxed fat, and kicked*] Jer. 5^{28} (Neh. 9^{25}); and 1 S. 2^{29}. Israel, which ought to have been docile and obedient, like an ox—or perhaps (Calv. Ew.) like a horse—that had grown fat and strong through good feeding, and had consequently become intractable (cf. Hos. 4^{16}; Is. 10^{27} RV. *m.*), turned rebelliously against its Owner and Benefactor.—*Wast gorged with food*] see below. Grätz: עָשִׁתָּ *becamest sleek* (Jer. 5^{28}). In line 2, notice the impassioned and pointed address to Israel itself, and also the accumulation of

15. עָבִית] 1 K. 12^{10} (=2 Ch. 10^{10})†.—כָּשִׂיתָ] only here. The meaning is uncertain. Ges. (originally) and Keil from *kasha'a, to eat greedily*, esp. cucumbers, *kashi'a, to be gorged* with food (Lane, p. 2613),—to which, of course, strictly a form כָּשָׁא (cf. Arab. *shani'a*=שָׂנֵא, *mali'a*=מָלֵא) would correspond in Hebrew. Ibn 'Ezra states that some commentators explained the word from Job 15^{27} (כִּסָּה פניו בחלבו), *to be covered*, viz. with fat; so Ges. in *Thes.*, remarking that his former expl. involved a ὕστερον πρότερον. This may be true; but the objection is hardly a decisive one: the etym. from כסה requires more to be supplied than is probable, viz. the crucial *with fat* (see AV.), and philologically (assuming the soundness of the text) the etym. form *kashi'a* is decidedly preferable. RV. *art become sleek* does not express any particular etymology. The versions merely conjecture from the context (𝔊 ἐπλατύνθη, 𝔙 *dilatatus*, Onq. Ps.-Jon. 𝔖 קנא נכסין) *gained riches*,—either paraphrasing, or perhaps reading כשית [so some 30 MSS. and old edd., *ap.* De Rossi, *Var. Lect.* Supplem. p. 25], cf. Syr. כשא *to heap up, collect*. For the forcible ἀσύνδετον, cf. Jud. 5^{27} (כרע נפל שכב).—אלוה] the *singular* (though in use in Arab. and Aram.) is in Heb. probably only a secondary form, obtained inferentially from אלהים: it is chiefly poetical, and, except perhaps Ps. 18^{32} (where 2 S. 22^{32} has אל), it is not otherwise found in writings earlier than the age of Jer.: viz. v.^{17} Hab. 1^{11} 3^{3} Is. 44^{8} Ps. 50^{22} 114^{7} 139^{19} Pr. 30^{5}, 41 times in Job, 2 K. 17^{31} Kt. (Qrê אלהי) and in late prose, Neh. 9^{17} 2 Ch. 32^{15} Dan. 11$^{37.38.38.39}$†.

Digitized by Google

synonyms designed to emphasize the idea to be expressed (cf. Is. 8^{15} 52^{13}).—*Which made him*] as v.[6].—*Treated as senseless* (וַיְנַבֵּל)] or *with contumely*: a strong term, prop. *treat as a* נָבָל (v.[6. 21]), or senseless, irreligious person (see on 22^{21}), who only deserves contumely, Jer. 14^{21} Mic. 7^{6} Nah. 3^{6}†.—צור ישעתו] Ps. 89^{27}; צור ישע 2 S. 22^{47} Ps. 95^{1}. The four clauses of this verse express a climax: [a] states the cause and beginning of Israel's lapse, [b] depicts it as confirmed, [c] describes how Israel forsook Jehovah, [d] how it ended by loading Him with contempt.—**16.** Cf. Ps. 78^{58}. The verse exemplifies how Israel had treated Jehovah with contumely (v.[15]), viz. by robbing Him, its Benefactor, of the honour which was His due, and bestowing it upon false gods,—the intrinsic worthlessness of which is then further illustrated in v.[17]. On the *jealousy*, and *vexation* (not *anger*, AV.) of God—both aroused, in particular, by a preference shown towards false gods—see on 4^{24} and 4^{25}.—*Abominations*] cf. 7^{25}: in the pl., of wicked or idolatrous practices $18^{9.12}$ 20^{18}; 1 K. 14^{24} 2 K. 16^{3} $21^{2.11}$ (all Deut.); Jer. 7^{10} 44^{22}; and esp. in Ez. (39 times), as $5^{9.11}$ $8^{6.9.13.15.17}$. Perhaps here of the idols themselves: cf. 2 K. 23^{13} Is. 44^{19}.—*Strange ones* (זָרִים)] of gods alien to Jehovah, or perhaps as introduced from foreign lands: so Jer. 2^{25} 3^{13} (notice the context), זָר Is. 43^{12}, אֵל זָר Ps. 44^{21} 81^{10}.—**17.** The *Shêdim* are alluded to besides only in a late Psalm (106^{37}): if the statement there made rests upon a genuine tradition, human sacrifices were offered to them.

The precise nature of the ideas associated with the "Shêdim" is uncertain, the two notices of them in the OT. being insufficient to fix them decisively. In Assyrian, *shîdu* is the name of the divinities represented by the bull-colossi, so often found in the front of Assyrian palaces, who were regarded apparently not as gods properly so called, but as subordinate spirits, demi-gods or genii, invested with power for good or evil (Schrader, *KAT.*[2] pp. 39, 160). The feelings with which a *shîdu* was regarded in Assyria may be illustrated from the invocation of an Assyrian king (Lenormant, *Les Origines de l'Histoire*, i. 114), "In this palace may the gracious *shîdu*, the gracious colossus, guardian of the steps of my majesty, continue his presence always," &c. If the root be the same as the Arab. *sâda*, *to hold dominion*, the word will be substantially the same as *sayyid* (whence the Spanish *Cid*), *lord*, *master*, *prince* (of the same form as צַר from עור, גֵּר from גור, &c.). 𝔊 renders by δαιμόνια; and in Aram. שֵׁירָא is common (*e.g.* 𝔗 Lev. 17^{7} Is. 13^{21} Ps. 91^{6}; and oft. in the Syriac Version of the NT.) in

Digitized by Google

the sense of *demon* or *evil spirit*; but this usage hardly determines the ideas associated long previously with the Heb. *Shêdim*. שד appears to occur as a divine name in the Phœnician n. pr. נרשר or נרשר (Nöld. *ZDMG.* 1888, p. 481). Most probably the term denotes some kind of subordinate spirit or demi-god. Cf. Baudissin, *Sem. Rel.-gesch.* i. 130 ff.; Delitzsch, *Paradies*, pp. 153, 154; Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 290, 440, 445, 446, 449, 450, 456, 463.

The poet at once proceeds to deny the divinity of the *Shêdim* by characterizing them as the negation of deity, as a "no-god": see below, for other examples of the forcible and pregnant Hebrew idiom employed for the purpose.—*Whom they knew not*] as Israel "knew" Jehovah: cf. 11^{28} $13^{7(6)}$ $29^{25(26)}$ Hos. 13^{4} (RV. *marg.*). The deities in question are described further as *new ones* (Jud. 5^{8}), introduced recently, in ironical contrast to Jehovah, who had been the nation's God from of old (מעולם Is. 63^{16}).—*Shuddered not*] an uncommon word (Jer. 2^{12} Ez. 27^{35} 32^{10}†), perhaps denoting here a superstitious horror or dread ("Das Wort veranschaulicht mit grosser Kunst das Unheimliche des Götzendienstes," Kamp.). Even this had not been felt by the Israelites of old for the gods whom their sons had now learnt to honour. For another view of the meaning, see below.—**18.** The climax of ingratitude: Israel forgot Him, to whom, as a Father (v.$^{6.15}$) it owed its existence as a nation, and who (by an effective change of figure) is represented at the same time as a mother, travailing with her infant, and bringing him painfully into the world. For the combined use of the two figures, cf. (in parallel clauses) Jer. 2^{27} Job 38^{29}; also (Le Clerc) 1 Cor. 4^{15} Philem. ^{10} Gal. 4^{19}: the combination, with reference to one and the same subject, is bold; but the figure of the mother is suggested, probably, partly by the parallelism, partly by the desire to emphasize the tender affection with which Jehovah regarded

17. לא אֱלֹהַּ] cf. v.^{21} לא אל and לא עם, Is. 10^{15} לא עץ, 31^{8} חרב לא איש and חרב לא אדם, Am. 6^{13} השמחים ללא דבר; Jer. 5^{7} and have sworn בלא אלהים by *not-gods* (cf. 2^{11} 16^{20}), 2 Ch. 13^{9} and became a priest ללא אלהים to *not-gods*, Is. 55^{2} Ps. 44^{13} (Ew. § 287^{g}; G-K. 152. 1 *n.*). With לא בניו v.^{5} (if the text be sound), cf. לא עמי Hos. 1^{9} 2^{25}.—מִקָּרֹב] cf. Job 20^{5} Ez. 7^{8}; Jer. 23^{23} (in *local* sense)†.—שְׂעָרוּם] "𝔊 has εἴδησαν, which agrees with Arab. *sha'ara, to perceive*, and to a certain extent with Aram. סער *to visit, inspect, keep an eye on*. The rendering seems to me to be not so unworthy of consideration as Dillm. appears to think, who does not even mention it" (W.R.S.). The same explanation is given by Barth, *Etym. Studien* (1893), p. 67.

Digitized by Google

His people (cf. Jud. 10^{16} Is. 63^{9}).—*Travailed with thee* (מחוללך)] prop. *writhed, was in anguish, with thee* (Ps. $51^{7\,(5)}$ Is. 51^{2} *al.*; cf. the phrase חִיל כַּיּוֹלֵדָה *travail-pains, anguish*, as of a parturient woman, Ps. $48^{7\,(6)}$ *al.*), fig. of God, as here, Ps. 90^{2} וַתְּחוֹלֵל ארץ ותבל, cf. Pr. $8^{24.\,25}$ (חוֹלָלְתִּי, of Wisdom).

19–22. The punishment evoked by Israel's defection.

19 And Jehovah saw, and spurned,
By reason of the vexation occasioned by his sons and his daughters.
20 And he said, "I will hide my face from them,
"I will see what their latter end will be;
"For they are a generation given to perversions,
"Sons in whom is no faithfulness.
21 "They have made me jealous with a no-god,
"They have vexed me with their vanities;
"And I will make them jealous with a no-people,
"With a senseless nation will I vex them.
22 "For a fire is kindled in my nostril,
"And it burneth unto the nethermost She'ōl;
"And it devoureth the earth and its increase,
"And setteth ablaze the foundations of the mountains.

19. *Saw*] as the occasion of the action which ensued, as Is. 59^{16}.—*Spurned* (וַיִּנְאָץ)] absol. as Jer. 14^{21}: cf. Lam. 2^{6} (also of God), Jer. 33^{24} Pr. 1^{30} 5^{12} 15^{5} Ps. 107^{11}. The *vexation* (כַּעַס) *of his sons and daughters* is the chagrin and disappointment occasioned to the father by the unmerited dishonour received at his children's hands (cf. on 4^{25}).—**20–21.** Jehovah's determination in consequence, expressed both negatively (v.[20]) and positively (v.[21]). The speech here beginning extends to the end of v.[27].—**20.** Jehovah will withdraw from them His favourable regard (31^{17}), and, leaving them, as it were, to themselves, will wait to see what their final lot (v.[29] Job 8^{7}) will then be: He will do this, because they have proved themselves to be a falsehood-loving race, sons (v.[5]) disloyal to a tender Parent.—*Perversions* (תַּהְפֻּכוֹת)] *i.e.* evasions of truth and right. The word is one which otherwise occurs only in the Proverbs: cf.

18. תֶּשִׁי] this can be only the pausal form of תֶּשִׁי, from שָׁיָה, like יְהִי 4^{33} from הָיָה: but the jussive form is inexplicable, and the other Semitic languages have only *sahā* (with ה) *to forget*, not שיה (with י). In all probability we should read תִּשָּׁה (cf. Sam. תשא), from נָשָׁה (Lam. 3^{17} *al.*) *to forget* (Dr. § 175).—**20.** תהפוכות] always in the pl. (cf. תחבולות); prop. *turnings about*, *i.e.* lines of action, or modes of speech, adopted for the sake of

Digitized by Google

below.—*In whom is no faithfulness*] opp. to God (v.[4]).—**21.** They will be rewarded according to the law of a righteous retribution: jealousy and vexation ($4^{24.\,25}$) on the one side will be requited with jealousy and vexation on the other; the "no-god" will be put to shame by a "no-people"; and Israel, "senseless" itself (v.[6]), will be taught a bitter lesson by a people "senseless" likewise.—*A no-god*] a contemptuous designation of the unreal gods, whom the Israelites followed after (cf. on v.[17]).—*Vanities*] הֶבֶל (lit. *a breath* Is. 57^{13}) denotes fig. what is evanescent, unsubstantial, worthless: hence of false gods, esp. in Jer.: in the sing. Jer. 10^{15} ($=51^{18}$) 16^{19} (comp. $2^5 = 2$ K. 17^{15}), and in the plural, as here, Jer. 8^{19} 10^8 14^{22} 1 K. $16^{13.\,26}$ (Deut.), Ps. 31^7 Jon. 2^9†.—*A no-people*] *i.e.*, most probably, a savage, undisciplined horde (Maurer, Ew. Kamp. Oettli). In the parallel clause, the foe is termed a *senseless nation* (cf. Ps. 74^{18} *senseless people*, of the heathen desecrators of the temple), *i.e.* (on v.[6]) an impious nation, insensible to the claims of God or man. With a heathen nation, unworthy to be called a "people," will Jehovah now provoke Israel's jealousy and vexation, by permitting it, viz. to win successes against His own people.

No-people, on the analogy of *no-god*, will denote something which, though in a sense capable of being termed a people, does not really deserve the name (cf. δῶρ' ἄδωρα, βίος ἀβίωτος, &c.). The term "people" implies a community which has attained a certain degree of civilization, and has learnt to submit to definite political and moral restraints: the לא עם will therefore denote a nation which is in some way deficient in these respects. It might thus be used, for instance, of the irregular, loosely organized bands—such as those of the Philistines, of the Midianites and "children of the East" (Jud. 6^{2-6}), or Aramæans (2 K. 5^2 6^{23})—at whose hands the Israelites sometimes experienced a sharp defeat; or it might denote an uncivilized horde, like the Scythians (the prototypes of the Goths and Vandals of a later age), who swept over Canaan under Josiah (comp. Jer. 5^{15-17}); or it might even, perhaps, denote a nation, so inhuman and barbarous in its habits, and especially in its conduct of war, as upon *moral* grounds to be unworthy of the name of people (comp. the terms used

---

escaping unpleasant realities, or evading the truth, *perversions* of truth or right. The word is used esp. in connexion with *utterances*, and occurs sometimes in proximity to עקשׁ *twisted* (v.[5]): Pr. 2^{12} איש מדבר ת׳, [14] who rejoice בת׳ רע (v.[15] whose paths are *twisted*, &c.), 6^{14} (a source of strife), 8^{13} $10^{31.\,32}$ 16^{28} (cf. 6^{14}) [30] 23^{33}†; cf. 17^{20}, where the נֶהְפָּךְ בלשנו is parallel with the *twisted in heart*.—אֵמֻון] only here: elsewhere אמונים or אמונה.

Digitized by Google

of a barbarian foe, Is. 24^{16b} 33^{1}). To judge from such descriptions as we possess, the Scythians, of all the peoples known to the Hebrews, were the most unlike other nations (comp. Rawlinson, *Anc. Mon.*[4] ii. 225 f., and the extract in *L.O.T.* p. 237); and hence would seem to answer best to the designation לא עם (though, of course, it does not follow that the Scythians are actually *meant* by the expression). It is probable that the poet has no definite people in view, but that, having heard by rumour of the desolations wrought elsewhere by the inroads of wild and savage barbarians, whom Israel would disdain to style a "people," he pictured such as the instruments in God's hands of the retribution awaiting Israel. The view of Schultz, Keil, and others, according to which the expression means "not a people in God's sight," a people not enjoying theocratic privileges, is not probable, or supported by the context: the term "people" being used absolutely, must connote what naturally and normally belongs to the idea of a "people," not what belongs to it (as in the case of Israel) exceptionally. "Not a people" is altogether different from "Not *my* people" (לא עמי) Hos. 1^{9}, which must have been used, had this been the sense which the expression was intended to convey.—In Rom. 10^{19} the passage is interpreted freely so as to refer to Israel's being provoked to jealousy by the heathen being admitted to the same theocratic privileges; but in the original context it is the favour shown to them by their being allowed to *punish* Israel, which moves Israel to jealousy.

22. The ground of this determination: Jehovah's wrath, or jealousy (4^{24}), kindled into an all-devouring flame, by Israel's shameful idolatry. The verse contains a graphic but hyperbolical description (for the context requires the judgment to be limited to *Israel*) of the far-reaching and destructive operation of the Divine anger. The first clause is repeated Jer. 15^{14}, and (with קדחתם for קדחה) 17^{4}.—*In my nostril*] as Ps. $18^{9(8)}$: cf. Is. 65^{5} (also of a fire kindled by the spectacle of Israel's idolatry).—*Nethermost She'ōl*] cf. Ps. 86^{13}: the stream of Jehovah's fire penetrates even to the Underworld (cf. Am. 9^{2}).—*Increase* (יְבוּל)] cf. 11^{17} (phil. n.).—*Foundations of the mountains*] Ps. $18^{8(7)}$.

23–25. The manifold forms of calamity in which Jehovah threatened that the judgment would discharge itself upon Israel.

23 "I will add evils upon them;
"Mine arrows I will exhaust against them:
24 "(So that they may be) sucked out by famine,
"And eaten up with the Fire-bolt and bitter Destruction;
"And the teeth of beasts I will send upon them,
"With the venom of crawling things of the dust.

22. קרחה] Jer. 15^{14} 17^{4} Is. 50^{11} 64^{1}†: קַדַּחַת 28^{22} Lev. 26^{16}†.

Digitized by Google

25 "Without the sword shall bereave,
"And in the chambers terror,
"(It shall destroy) both young man and virgin,
"The suckling with the man of grey hairs.

23. *Add* (אספה)] point אֹסִפָה (from יָסַף); and cf. Ez. 5^{16} Lev. 26^{21}. אַסְפֶּה, from סָפָה ($29^{18\,(19)}$) *to carry* or *sweep away*, yields no suitable sense, to "sweep *together*, *heap up*," being a questionable paraphrase.—*Evils*] $31^{17.\,21}$.—*Exhaust*] lit. *finish*: none will remain unused.—*Arrows*] fig. of Divine chastisements, as v.[42] Ez. 5^{16} Ps. $7^{14\,(13)}$ $38^{3\,(2)}$ Job 6^{4}: cf. Lam. $3^{12.\,13}$.—**24.** 𝔊 omits *and* before *the teeth*, in which case the verse will be unconnected with v.[23], and "so that they may be" must be omitted; the meaning being, "When they are already exhausted by famine and pestilence, wild beasts and poisonous reptiles will be sent amongst them." *Famine*, particularly in a siege, is a judgment frequently threatened, as Is. 5^{13} and esp. in Jer. Ez.: the former has often the combination, "The sword, the famine, and the pestilence" (14^{12} 21^{9} $27^{8.\,13}$ &c.: cf. Ez. 5^{12} 6^{11} 7^{15}), to which Ez. ($14^{15.\,21}$) adds "evil beasts," as the fourth of the "four sore judgments," which Jehovah sends upon a sinful land (cf. here v.[24-25]).—*Eaten up* (לְחֻמֵי)] לָחַם is a poet. syn. of. אָכַל, found chiefly in Pr. (Pr. 4^{17} 9^{5} $23^{1.\,6}$ Ps. 141^{4}†).—*The Fire-bolt* (רֶשֶׁף)] a poetical designation of the fiery darts, sent by Jehovah, to which the poet (or popular imagination) attributed fever, or other pestilential complaint. Cf. Hab. 3^{5} (where the terribly active malady is almost personified) "Before Him goeth Pestilence (דֶּבֶר: comp. here קֶטֶב); and the Fire-bolt proceedeth at His feet."

In Heb. רשף is a poet. word for *a flame*, esp. a *pointed*, *darting flame* Cant. 8^{6} Job 5^{7} Ps. 76^{4} (רשפי קשת, fig. of arrows) 78^{48}†. In Phœnician,

23. אספה] 𝔊 συνάξω, 𝔙 *congregabo*, 𝔖 אכנש,—no doubt vocalizing אֹסְפָה (Mic. 4^{6}), from אסף.—**24.** מְזֵי] from sg. מָזֶה only here, though restored by Hitz. Ew. Del. Cheyne, Di. in Is. 5^{13}. The word is not above suspicion: but if correct, it most probably means *drained* or *sucked out*, from מָזָה= Arab. *mazza*, to *suck* (cf. מָצָה, Syr. מְצָא, by the side of מָצַץ, Syr. מַץ), a variation of the more usual *maṣṣa* (which agrees with Aram. מְצַץ, Heb. מָצַץ Is. 66^{11}†). 𝔊 τηκόμενοι, as though from מָסָה, Syr. מְסָא: unsuitable, as an effect of *hunger*. A.V. *burnt* follows Ibn 'Ezra and Ḳimchi שרופי רעב, who compares לְמֵזֵא Dan. 3^{19} (Aram. inf. of אֲזָא), though allowing that the root of this has no מ. Grätz conjectures רָזֵי *emaciated*.—מרירי] only here.

however, the name (or title) of a deity is derived from it: *CIS*. I. i. 89, in a bilingual inscription from Idalion in Cyprus, a prince Ba'alram erects an image, in the Greek text τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Ἀμυκλοῖ, in the Phœnician לרשף מכל (Resheph of Amyklæ); *ib.* 90 סרקע חרץ או אש יתן מלך מלכיתן מלך כתי אדיל בן בעלרם לאלי לרשף מכל באדיל בירח בל בשנת וו למלכי על כתי ואדיל כשמע קל יברך, *i.e.* "This is the patten [from רקע *to spread out*] of gold [=Heb. חרוץ] which Milkyaton, king of Kition and Idalion, son of Ba'alram, gave to his god, *Resheph of Mikal*, in Idalion, in the month of Bul [1 K. 6[38]], in the 2nd year of his reigning over Kition and Idalion, because he listened to his voice: may he bless (him)!" רשף מכל occurs also *ib.* 91, 93, 94: רשף אלהיתם=Απολωνι τωι Αλασιωται, and רשף אלייח=Απειλωνι τωι Ελυται, are found on two inscriptions from Tamassus, also in Cyprus (see Euting, *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Acad. 1887, p. 115 f.; or *Proc. Bibl. Arch.* 1887, ix. pp. 47 f., 100 f., 153 f.; and cf. Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil d'Arch. Orient.* pp. 176 f., 198 f.); רשפחץ is the name of another local רשף (*CIS. ib.* 10), conjectured by Clermont-Ganneau, *l.c.* p. 179 ff., to be Ἀπόλλων Ἀγυιεύς; the pr. names רשפיתן "Resheph has given," and עבדרשף occur (*ib.* 44, 88, 393); *Raspu* or *Resoup*, as the name of an Asiatic god, is named on Egyptian Inscriptions (*ib.* p. 38): it can thus hardly be accidental that the modern name of the town which occupies the site of the ancient *Apollonias*, near Jaffa, should be *Arsuph* (Ganneau, p. 177). As Apollo, under one of his aspects, was the author of pestilence (*Il.* i. 50 f.; cf. his epithets ἑκάεργος, ἑκηβόλος, ἑκατηβόλος), it is not (in view of the senses borne by the Heb. רשף) too bold a conjecture that רשף (*Resheph*, or *Reshûph*?) was the name of the Phœnician Fire-god, who smites men and cattle with his fiery darts, producing in them fever and other plagues; and that רשף, here and Hab. 3[5], denotes the fiery bolts, by which Jehovah was imagined to produce pestilence or fever. 𝔊 βρώσει ὀρνέων, Onq. אכילי עוף, Aq. [βεβρωμένοι πετηνῷ], 𝔙 *devorabunt eos aves*, 𝔖 ולפירא אשלם אנון, in accordance with the interpretation of בני רשף in Job 5[7] as=*birds* (cf. Hab. 3[5] ΑΣΘ 𝔖; Sir. 43[17] Heb. and 𝔊).

Destruction (קֶטֶב)] properly, it seems, *excidium*; of a pestilential epidemic, as Ps. 91[6] (‖ דֶּבֶר *pestilence*). Only Is. 28[2] besides שַׂעַר קֶטֶב; cf. קֹטֶב Hos. 13[14]. By *bitter* is meant *poisonous* or *malignant*.—*The teeth of beasts*] a poetical variation of חַיָּה רָעָה *evil beasts* (Lev. 26[6] Ez. 5[17] *al.*), or חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה Lev. 26[22] (with והשלחתי) Hos. 2[14 (12)] &c.—*Crawling things of the dust*] cf. Mic. 7[17] זֹחֲלֵי אֶרֶץ. The root signifies *to withdraw, retire*; and the expression denotes reptiles such as crawl away to hide themselves under stones, plants, &c. For the threat itself, cf. Jer. 8[17].—**25.** The terrible realities of war will wreak bereavement alike through the streets and in the houses:

25. מחוץ . . . מחדרים] מן is *off*, idiom.=*on the side of*: מחוץ=*outside* is frequent; מחדרים is a poet. variation of מבית *on the side of the house*=*within* (*e.g.* Ez. 7[15] החרב בחוץ והדבר והרעב מבית).—תשכל] is elsewhere always

Digitized by Google

neither age nor sex will be spared. Lam. 1^{20b} is a reminiscence of clauses [a, b]; cf. also Ez. 7^{15} Jer. $9^{20(21)}$. With clauses [c, d], compare such passages as Hos. 14^{1} (13^{16}), 2 K. 8^{12} Lam. 2^{21} Jer. 18^{21} 51^{22} 2 Ch. 36^{17}: the young men, in particular, are often specified as the victims of an invasion.

26–27. In fact, only dread of the adversaries' taunts had withheld Jehovah from resolving on Israel's annihilation.

26 "I should have said, 'I will cleave them in pieces,
"'I will make their memory to cease from men';
27 "Except I dreaded the vexation caused by the enemy,
"Lest their adversaries should misdeem,
"Lest they should say, 'Our hand is exalted,
"'And not Jehovah hath wrought all this.'"

26. On clause [a], see below; with clause [b], cf. 25^{19} Ps. 9^{7} 34^{17} 109^{15} Job 18^{17}.—**27.** Jehovah is represented again (cf. v.[19])

construed with an accus. of the person bereaved, here it is followed loosely, after the *athnaḥ*, by an accus. of the person carried off.—**26.** אפאיהם] a very uncertain word. פֵּאָה is a *corner*; but no verb פאה is otherwise known in Heb.; and Syr. פאי is *decorus fuit, decuit*. (1) AV. has "scatter them into corners," following Rashi (אשיתם פאה להשליכם מעלי) and Ḳimchi (אפזר בכל פאה), in treating the word as a denom. from פאה, which can hardly be said to be probable. (2) Most moderns (Ges. Ew. Kamp. Knob. Keil, Dillm.) render "will blow them away." This, however, is exceedingly questionable: no root פאה *to blow* is known; and פעה, of which פאה is assumed to be a softened form, means nothing but *to cry out* (Is. 42^{14}†), in Syriac *to bleat* (also *to cry out*): the meaning (Ges.) *flavit, sibilavit*, is purely conjectural, assumed solely for the purpose of explaining אפעה *viper*, and entirely without support in Arabic (Lane, p. 2421). (3) The Arab. *fa'ā* is *to cleave* or *split* (*e.g.* the head, or a bowl); and אפאיהם is explained from this by Schultens, *Opp. Minora* (1769), p. 158 ("exscinderem eos"), J. D. Michaelis, *Supplem. ad Lexica Heb.* p. 1987, Schröter in Merx, *Archiv*, i. 461. If the text be sound (which, it must be owned, is doubtful), this meaning has most to recommend it, (2) being decidedly the least probable of all. 𝔊 διασπερῶ (whence Grätz emends אפיצם). Sam. reads אפי הם, whence Sam. Targ. has רגוינון (for רגזי אנון) "they are my anger"; Onq. ייחול רוגזי עליהון ואישיצינון (a double rend.); 𝔖 איכא אנון, Aq. [καὶ ποῦ εἰσιν;], 𝔙 *ubinam sunt?* (*i.e.* אַף אֵי הֵם: the division into three words is in harmony with the Jewish methods, which Aq. elsewhere follows (*Notes on Sam.* pp. xliii, lxxxiv); it is noticed by Rashi and Ibn 'Ezra *ad loc.* as an old Jewish view of the word). For the יהם in אפאיהם, cf. G-K. §§ 58. 1; 75 R[19].—אשביתה] Am. 8^{4}.—מאנוש זכרם] notice the Heb. order: obj. at the end rounding off the sentence. So oft., as Is. 37^{33} ולא ישפך עליך סללה, Jud. 1^{24} ועשינו עמך חסד, Ps. 105^{14} ויוכח עליהם מלכים: add Ex. 8^{17} Am. 6^{14} Jer. 13^{13} Ps. 15^{3} 24^{4} 25^{15} $26^{6,9}$ &c.; and cf. on 2 S. 14^{12}. The Heb. order would be stiff and unnatural in Engl.: conversely the Engl. order would be weak in Hebrew.

Digitized by Google

as influenced by the human emotion of כַּעַס, *chagrin* or *vexation*: the enemy, by taking to themselves the credit of annihilating the Chosen People, and not recognizing in their success Jehovah's hand, would not render Him His due; and the dishonour thus done to Him would occasion Him כַּעַס, *vexation* at unmerited treatment or a slight. A similar anthropomorphism is implied, when it is said that Jehovah does anything *for His name's sake*, *i.e.* to maintain His reputation: comp. Is. $48^{9.11}$ Jer. $14^{7.21}$ Ez. $20^{9.14.22}$ $36^{21f.}$; also Ex. 32^{12} Nu. $14^{15f.}$ Dt. 9^{28}.—*Misdeem*] *i.e.* fail to recognise the truth (lit. *treat as foreign*, Jer. 19^{4} Job 21^{29} "and their tokens ye will not *mistake*").—*Dreaded* (אָגוּר)] 1^{17} 18^{22}.—*Is exalted*] more exactly, *hath become high* (רָמָה the perf., not רָמָה the ptcp.), *i.e.* hath lifted itself up successfully, hath asserted itself triumphantly: the same idiom Is. 26^{11} Ps. 89^{14} (of the arm).—*And not Jehovah*] but, it is implied, another. The adverb, in virtue of its position, negatives not the verb but the subst.; the heathen nations are represented as insinuating, in the supposed case, that they have been themselves the sole authors of Israel's ruin.—*Wrought* (פָּעַל)] a poet. word, often used of a manifestation of Divine power: Nu. 23^{23} (מה פעל אל) Hab. 1^{5} Is. 26^{12} 41^{4} 43^{13} Ps. 44^{2} 68^{29} 74^{12} Job 22^{17} 33^{29}.

28–29. The reason why Jehovah had been forced to threaten His people thus severely; Israel's inveterate inability to discern its true welfare.—The poet here speaks again in his own person.

27. ולא יהוה פעל כל זאת] in place of the usual יהוה לא פעל ת׳. So Nu. 16^{29} לא יהוה שלחני not J. (but another) hath sent me, Gn. 45^{8} *al.* (Dav. § 127*a*).—**28.** אֹבַד עצות] irreg. for אֹבֵד, the pathaḥ being otherwise found (in the *st. c.* of the ptcp.) only before ע (נֹטַע, רֹקַע, שֹׁסַע). Bö (i. 214) collects examples (such as פֹּרַד עיני Jer. 13^{17} Lam. 3^{48}, תָּלַן עיני Job 17^{2}, הָעָצַר המגפה Nu. 17^{13} *al.*; and Piel forms, as גִּדַּל המלך Est. 3^{1}, אִבַּד המלך 2 K. 21^{3}, חִשַּׁב עם Lev. 25^{50} &c.) tending to show that it is due here to the guttural of עצות; but it is doubtful if this explanation is correct, for the pathaḥ occurs also where there is no gutt., as Lam. 2^{9} Lev. 25^{52} Is. 14^{32} *al.* (cf. *ib.* ii. 286). Stade, § 213^{a} 107^{a}, cites other analogies for ־ַ, but only when next to a gutt., or ר.—עצות] cf. בינות, בִּטָּחוֹת, נבורות, דעות, חכמות, חמות, ישועות, ידידות, בושרות, מנוחות, מרורות (v.[32]), נקמות, צדקות, שמחות, תבונות, &c. (cf. Dav. § 17 R.[2]). The pl. in such cases (chiefly poet.) has an intensive force; whatever kind of counsel, understanding, might, &c., there may be scope for (cf. G-K. § 124^{e}).

Digitized by Google

28 For they are a people lost in counsel,
And there is no understanding in them;
29 If they had been wise, they would understand this,
They would discern their latter end.

V.^{28} emphasizes Israel's lack of insight, and assigns it ("For") as the ground of the withdrawal of Jehovah's favour (v.$^{20-27}$); v.^{29} declares that had Israel been wise, it would have understood *this*, viz. the necessity of such chastisements as those just described (v.$^{20-25}$), and discerned *their latter end* (v.^{20}), *i.e.* the final issue of the course they were pursuing, in case either they themselves neglected to repent, or God out of regard to His honour (v.$^{26f.}$) did not interpose to save them. For *lost* (or *perishing*) *in respect of counsel*, cf. Jer. 49^{7}.

30–33. Israel's disasters are due only to Jehovah's alienation, occasioned by Israel's sin: the heathen gods have not the power to produce them (v.^{31}); the heathen nations are too corrupt to do so (v.$^{32f.}$).

30 How should one chase a thousand,
And two put ten thousand to flight,
Were it not that their Rock had sold them,
And Jehovah had delivered them up?
31 For their rock is not as our Rock,
Our enemies being the umpires.
32 For their vine is from the vine of Sodom,
And from the fields of Gomorrha:
Their grapes are grapes of poison,
They have bitter clusters.
33 Their wine is the venom of reptiles,
And the cruel poison of cobras.

30. How could a mere handful of the foe have routed whole battalions of Israelites, unless Jehovah had deliberately abandoned them? The verse points to military disasters actually experienced by Israel's troops, and argues that, as they cannot be reasonably attributed to Jehovah's inability to defend His people, they must be taken as proof that He has, for some sufficient cause, designedly cast them off. With the image used to describe the rout, comp. Is. 30^{17}, and the contrasted promise of Lev. 26^{8}; Jos. 23^{10}.—*Their Rock*] *i.e.* Jehovah (v.$^{4. 15}$).—*Sold*] the same figure which is found Jud. 2^{14} 3^{8} $4^{2. 9}$ 10^{7} (all Deut., except 4^{9}), 1 S. 12^{9} (Deut.), Ez. 30^{12}

29. יבינו לאחריתם] Ps. 73^{17} אבינה לאחריתם.—**30.** אם לא כי] *v. Lex.* כִּי *ad fin.*

Ps. 44^{13}†.—**31.** For, as the nations themselves are obliged to own, their "rock" (*i.e.* their god, or gods) cannot vie in might with Israel's "Rock" (comp. *e.g.* Ex. 14^{25}; Nu. 23–24; Jos. $2^{9f.}$; 1 S. 4^{8} $5^{7.\,10f.}$ 1 K. $20^{23\text{-}30}$), and cannot therefore have brought about Israel's disasters.—**32.** The "for" is parallel to the "for" of v.[31]; and the verses describe, for the sake of setting it aside, a second cause that might be imagined for Israel's disasters: the moral corruption of the heathen nations is such that Jehovah can have had no inducement to aid them against Israel (v.[30c. d]) on their own account; He must have been alienated by Israel's sin.—*Their vine*] *i.e.* their nature, represented under this figure. The nations are compared to a vine whose stock is derived from the growth of Sodom and Gomorrha: its fruits are accordingly poisonous and bitter; and the wine made from them is as deadly as a cobra's bite. The comparison brings out the fact that their doings are the natural outcome of an innate corrupt *disposition*, a corrupt natural stock.—*The vine of Sodom*] *i.e.* a vine whose juices and fruits were not fresh and healthy, but tainted by the corruption of which Sodom was the type.—**33.** *Poison*] $29^{17\,(18)}$.—*Reptiles* (תַּנִּינִים)] a generic term, commonly applied to marine monsters (Gn. 1^{21} *al.*), but sometimes used of land-reptiles, Ex. $7^{9.\,10.\,12}$ Ps. 91^{13b}. "*Dragon*" (AV., RV.) is merely an old English synonym of *serpent* (δράκων).—*Cobras*] פֶּתֶן recurs Is. 11^{8} Ps. 58^{5} 91^{13a} (‖ תַּנִּין, as here), Job $20^{14.\,16}$†. According to Tristram (*NHB.* p. 275; *DB*². *s.v.* Asp), the species of serpent denoted by פתן is the hooded cobra of Egypt, the *Naja haje*, which though it is not found in the cultivated districts of Palestine, is well known in the plains, and the downs S. of Beersheba'. It is the species upon which serpent-charmers (Ps. 58^{5}) usually practise in Egypt, as they do upon an allied species, the *Naja tripudians*, in India; it is also in the habit of frequenting holes in rocks or old walls (Is. 11^{8}).

31. ואויבינו פללים] a circumst. clause, as Gn. 18^{12} ואדני זקן="my lord being old" (Dr. § 159; Dav. § 138*a*).—פללים] Ex. 21^{22} Job 31^{11}†; פלילה Is. 16^{3}†; cf. 28^{7} Job 31^{28}. The rare word (with its cognates) appears to have expressed the idea of *arbiter, arbitration*: cf. פִּלֵּל *to mediate* 1 S. 2^{25} Ps. 106^{30} Ez. 16^{52}.—**32.** ענבי] G-K. § 20. 2 (2) *b*.—מרֹרֹת] מרורה only besides Job 13^{26}; 20^{14} (מרורת פתנים); and, in the sense of *gall*, *ib.* v.[25].

Digitized by Google

The view of v.[32-33] adopted above is that of Ew. Kamp. Dillm. According to others (Kn. Keil, Oettli) these verses describe the moral character of *Israel*, for the purpose of deducing from it directly the disasters which have befallen it. In support of this interpretation, it might be urged that the thought of Israel's corruption as the ground of its misfortunes is the general theme of the poem, and that the figures employed are elsewhere frequently used with reference to Israel (the vine, as Hos. 10[1] Jer. 2[21] Ps. 80[9ff.]; the comparison to Sodom, as Is. 1[10] 3[9] Jer. 23[14] Ez. 16[46-49] Lam. 4[6]). The alternative view is, however, supported by the context in v.[34ff.], which plainly speaks of Jehovah's vengeance on Israel's *foes*, and where, if v.[32f.] do not describe the corruption of the heathen, there is nothing for הוא ("that") to refer to: it is, moreover, to be noticed that in v.[32] it is not said that the vine has *degenerated* from its original stock (as might have been expected, if Israel were intended, cf. Is. 5[2] Jer. 2[21]), but that it is corrupt in its origin (its vine *is from* the vine of Sodom).

34–36. But such corruption cannot remain for ever unnoticed by Jehovah: it calls for vengeance; and in the end He will interpose on His people's behalf, and abandon their enemies to destruction.

34 Is not that laid up in store with me,
Sealed up in my treasuries?
35 Mine is [Sam. 𝔊: Against the day of] vengeance and recompense,
Against the time when their foot slippeth;
For near is the day of their calamity,
And the destined future hasteth upon them.
36 For Jehovah will judge his people,
And repent himself concerning his servants;
When he seeth that support is gone,
And that neither fettered nor free remaineth.

34. The reference is to the moral corruption of the heathen, and its fruits (v.[32f.]); these are not forgotten, or disregarded by Jehovah, but (as it were) *stored up* with Him, till the day of retribution shall arrive. For the figures employed, cf. Hos. 13[12] (צָרוּר עֲוֹן אֶפְרָיִם), Job 14[17] (חָתֻם בִּצְרוֹר פִּשְׁעִי), where sin is spoken of as *bound up*, or *sealed in a bag*, viz. against the day of punishment; for *treasuries*, also, in various figurative applications, see 28[12] Jer. 10[13] 50[25] Ps. 33[7] Job 38[22].

That the reference both here and v.[35] is to the guilt of the heathen, not

---

34. כָּמֻס] no Semitic root כמס, with a meaning suitable here, is known. Most probably כָּנֻס should be read, from כנס *to collect*, *gather together*, Ps. 33[7] (‖ נותן באוצרות) *al.*: in the old character ם and נ might easily be confused. This, at least, is the sense that is required; and it is expressed by the Versions (𝔊 συνῆκται, Symm. ἀπόκειται, 𝔙 condita, 𝔖 נטיר: 𝔗 paraphrases הלא כל עובדיהון גלן קדמי).—עמדי] = *penes me* (Gn. 24[45]).

to that of Israel, is apparent from v.^{36} "*For* Jehovah will judge His people, and repent Himself towards His servants": the guilt of *Israel* could not be a motive for Jehovah's compassion towards them. Some commentators suppose "that" to point to what follows, viz. the coming judgment: but where a reference forwards is intended, זאת rather than הוא is commonly employed. Keil (referring the whole passage, v.$^{32-35}$, not to the heathen but to Israel) supposes "that" to have both a retrospective and a prospective reference, *i.e.* to include both the guilt of v.$^{32f.}$ and the judgment of v.^{36}. But it is not natural to understand הוא as pointing in two contrary directions: a reference to the judgment can only be included in v.^{34} indirectly, in so far as the figures employed in it suggest it implicitly.

35. Jehovah's vengeance will not be indefinitely deferred; the first reverse of Israel's foes will be followed speedily by their total fall.—*Mine is vengeance*] the words are not intended as a warning against self-vengeance (as the verse is applied, Rom. 12^{19})—for the prostrate nation is not in a condition to think of that: it is meant as a declaration that there is, after all, a source when vengeance will be forthcoming: "*I*, of whom, under the circumstances, you least expect it, will arise, and recompense your foes" (Kamp.). For the thought of Jehovah's *vengeance* (נקם), see v.$^{41.43}$ Is. 1^{24} Mic. $5^{14(15)}$ Nah. 1^{2} Ez. $25^{14.17}$ Jer. $5^{9.29}$ 9^{8} (cf. 11^{20} 20^{12}), 46^{10} $50^{15.28}$ $51^{6.11}$ (cf v.^{36}), Is. 34^{8} 35^{4} 47^{3} 59^{17} 61^{2} 63^{4}; cf. also Lev. 26^{25} (H), Nu. 31^{3} (P), Ps. 94^{1} 99^{8}. The idea is commoner in the later prophets (esp. those of the exile) than in the earlier ones.—*Against the time, &c.*] *i.e.* so soon as they once begin to totter, vengeance will speedily complete its work. The tottering of the foot is a frequent image of a reverse of fortune: Ps. $38^{17(16)}$ 94^{18}, cf. 66^{9} 121^{3}, and with מָעַד, Job 12^{5} Ps. 25^{19} (cf. Ps. 18^{37} 37^{31}). The righteous, when their foot totters, are upheld by Jehovah (Ps. 94^{18}): in the case of the wicked, a similar moment is seized by God's providence, for the purpose of completing their destruction. Sam. 𝔊, however, for לִי נָקָם "mine is vengeance" read לְיוֹם נָקָם "*against the day of* ven-

35. שִׁלֵּם] a subst., of a rare form, like דִּבֵּר Jer. 5^{13} קִטֵּר 44^{21} (Sta. § 222).—תמוט רגלם] a rel. clause, after לעת: cf. Job 6^{17}; Jer. 49^{8} 50^{31} 51^{33}.—וחש] the masc. sg., acc. to G-K. § 145. 7*a*; Dav. § 113*b*.—עתידות] an Aram. more than a Heb. word: cf. Syr. עתידתא = τὰ ἐρχόμενα Jn. 16^{13}; דעתידן = μέλλοντα Rom. 8^{38} *al.* In Heb. the root is seldom found, and chiefly in parts of the OT. either late or tinged dialectically with Aramaisms: the verb Pr. 24^{27} Job 15^{28}†; עתיד *ready* only besides Job 3^{8} 15^{24} Est. 3^{14} 8^{13}, and (in the sense

Digitized by Google

geance" (Jer. 46^{10} Is. 34^{8} 61^{2} 63^{4}), which connects well with v.[34] ("sealed up in my treasuries, *against the day* of vengeance and recompense"), and forms a good parallel with the following clause ("*against the time* when their foot slippeth"), and is very probably the original reading (Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 247; *Jüd. Ztschr.* ix. 92; Kamp. Klost. Dillm. Marti).—*The day of their calamity* (יום אידם)] a common expression, denoting the occasion of a sudden and (usually) irreparable disaster, Jer. 18^{17} 46^{21} Ob. [13] (thrice) Pr. 27^{10} Ps. $18^{19\,(18)}$ Job 21^{30}: the disastrous character of an אֵיד is illustrated also by the figures used in connexion with it, Pr. 1^{27} 6^{15}.—*The destined future*] lit. *things prepared*, or *ready* (עֲתִדֹת): see below.—*Hasteth*] cf. Is. 60^{22} Hab. 2^{3}.—**36.** The verse states the reason why Jehovah will at length assert Himself against His people's foes: the extremity of their need will move Him to take compassion upon them.—*Judge*] i.e. *give right to*, *vindicate* against foes or detractors, as Gn. 30^{6} Ps. $54^{3\,(2)}$ Pr. 31^{9}; and the synonym שָׁפַט frequently (Ps. $7^{9\,(8)}$ 26^{1} &c.).—*And repent himself, &c.*] cf. Ps. 90^{13}. The two clauses are repeated *verbatim*, Ps. 135^{14}.

Keil, referring v.[35] (as well as v.[32-34]) to Israel, is obliged to understand "judge" v.[36] in the sense of *condemn, punish*—"For Jehovah will judge (the wicked of) His people, but repent Himself concerning His (true) servants." This forced explanation of v.[36], however, only shows that the exegesis of v.[35] which necessitates it, is incorrect, and that the reference in that verse is really to the heathen. The only truth in Keil's contention is that, inasmuch as Jehovah naturally would not interpose to aid His people, so long as it remained obdurate, the Israel referred to in v.[36] is *implicitly* conceived as penitent (which is also indicated by the use in the parallel clause of the expression "His servants"): the fate of the *impenitent* Israelites lies here outside the range of the poet's thought. But such a pointed contrast between "His people" and "His servants" as Keil postulates is not probable.

That support is gone] Ew. "dass hingeschwunden jeder Halt." *Support* is lit. *hand*, used fig. in Heb. of power or

of *things prepared*, *stores*) Is. 10^{13}. In Aram. and New Heb. the verb occurs frequently in the sense of *to prepare* (*e.g.* a feast), *destine*; עתיד is often used with an inf., almost as a periphr. of the future (*e.g.* Eccl. 9^{12} 𝕿 מה דעתיד למהוי = what will happen): and לעתיד לבוא lit. "for that which is destined to come (*or* will come)" is a common New Heb. expression for "in the world to come."—**36.** יִתְנֶחָם] in pause for יִתְנַחֵם, the vowels ֵ ַ being avoided in Heb. with ח. So חַמִּי is in pause חָמִּי (not חֵמִּי), אַמִּי becomes אָמִּי, הֶחָרֵב הֶחָרָב, &c.—אזלת] the Aram. form of the 3 pf. fem.,—

Digitized by Google

competence (cf. Lev. 25[35] Is. 28[2] 57[10]; and *short-handed*, implying impotence, Nu. 11[23] Is. 37[27] קִצְרֵי יָד, 50[2] 59[1]); sometimes, also, of an artificial hand, or support (Ex. 26[17. 19]).—*The fettered and the free* (עצור ועזוב)] an alliterative proverbial expression, recurring in the Deut. passages 1 K. 14[10] 21[21] 2 K. 9[8] (עצור ועזוב בישראל), 14[26] (ואפס עצור ואפס עזוב)†, the precise sense of which it seems impossible, as Dillm. remarks, to determine with certainty, but which is meant evidently to be a comprehensive formula denoting *all* (comp. similar expressions 29[18 (19)] Job 12[16b]).

עצר is *to shut up, restrain, confine* (*e.g.* in a prison, Jer. 33[1]); עזב, in contrast to this, must, it seems, be used in the old sense, which it has Ex. 23[5] (cf. Job 10[1]), of *to let loose*. Nevertheless the particular idea which the two words here express is far from clear; and many explanations have been proposed: (1) the *imprisoned* and the *released* (Saad.); (2) *bond* and *free* (Ges., Dietrich, *Abhandl. z. Heb. Gr.* 1846, p. 205); (3) *kept in* (restrained by legal impurity from entering the sanctuary: cf. נעצר Jer. 36[5] Neh. 6[10], and עצור לפני יהוה 1 S. 21[8]) and *at large* (Ew. *Antiq.* p. 199; Smith, *Rel. Sem.*[2] p. 456, Smend, *AT. Rel.-gesch.* p. 126, Nowack, *Arch.* ii. 213); (4) *under* and *over age* (Thenius, Kamp.); (5) *married* and *celibate* (De Dieu, Keil); (6) *confined* at home (by age, weakness, &c.) and *free* to move about (the able-bodied warriors), Oettli. That of Ew. is perhaps as probable as any. The sense *celibate* (5) is established for the Arab. *'azīb*, but the meaning *paterfamilias*, alleged by De Dieu for *'aṣaru*, rests upon an error (see Röd. *Thes.* Append. p. 104). The meaning *celibate* is, however, too specially an Arabism to be adopted with safety for the Heb. עזוב. The versions render no help, the meaning of the expression being evidently unknown to them (*e.g.* 𝔊 ἐκλελοιπὼς καὶ παρειμένος; Onq. כלא ושביק; Pesh. "no helper or supporter"). Similar examples of phrases which name two categories, under one or other of which everybody is (virtually) included, are quoted from the Arabic; *e.g.* "the binder and the bound" (master and servant), Dietrich, *l.c.*; "he that has a companion and he that is alone" (Ew. *Gesch.* i. 182); "he that moveth and he that is still," "he that giveth to hear and he that heareth" (*'al-musmi'u wa'ssāmi'u*): see further Ges. *Thes.* pp. 1008, 1362. For the alliteration, cf. עֵר וְעֹנֶה (Mal. 2[12]), נִין וָנֶכֶד, שֹׁד וָשֶׁבֶר, שְׁאֵת וָשֶׁבֶר, שָׁמִיר וָשַׁיִת.

37–39. God will speak to them through the extremity of their need, bringing them to own, by the logic of facts, that the gods in whom they trusted are unworthy of their regard,

in reality, of course, the original form of the ending, though in Heb. (as in the ordinary fem. of substantives) the ת is usually softened to ה (Wright, *Compar. Gramm.* p. 167 f.). This is the only example of the form with a strong verb in Heb.: a few other cases occur with verbs ל״ה, ע״ו, &c. (G-K. §§ 44 R.[4]; 72 R.[1] [Ez. 46[17]]; 74 R.[1]; 75 R.[1]).—אזל] 1 S. 9[7] Jer. 2[36] Job 14[11] Pr. 20[14]†. In Aram. the usual word for *to go away*.

Digitized by Google

and so making it possible for Himself to interpose on their behalf.—The verse supplies the thought that was missing in v.[36], viz. of the moral change wrought in Israel by its need, which would be the necessary condition of Jehovah's being able to "repent," and receive them again into His favour (Ew. Dillm.).

37 And he will say, "Where are their gods,
"The rock in whom they sought refuge?
38 "They that ate the fat of their sacrifices,
"And drank the wine of their drink-offering(s)—
"Let them rise up, and help you,
"Let there [Sam. 𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙: them] be a shelter over you.
39 "See now that I, I am he,
"And there is no god with me:
"*I* slay, and make alive,
"I have wounded, and *I* heal;
"And there is no deliverer out of my hand.

37. In their need, Jehovah ironically bids the Israelites have recourse to the gods, on whose help they had relied, and whose favour they had sought to win by their sacrifices (cf. for the thought Jud. 10[14] Jer. 2[28]). The manner in which God is here supposed to address His people is through the circumstances of their need: in that need they, as it were, hear His voice convincing them of the folly of their self-chosen course, and moving them to look to Him as their true and sole support. *Rock* is used here ironically of the false gods, as v.[31].—*Sought* (or *took*) *refuge*] the verb (חסה) found so often in the Psalms of taking refuge in Jehovah: *e.g.* Ps. 2[12] 7[2 (1)] 18[3 (2)] (צוּר אֶחֱסֶה בּוֹ); cf. the subst. מַחֲסֶה *refuge*, Ps. 14[6] 46[2] 61[4] *al.* The proper sense of the verb is apparent from the passages where it is followed by a word, such as *shadow* or *wings*, definitely expressing a locality, as Jud. 9[15] (lit.), Is. 14[32] 30[2] Ps. 36[8] (בצל כנפיך יחסיון) 57[2].—*A shelter* (סִתְרָה)] cf. the masc. סֵתֶר, of Jehovah, Ps. 32[7] 91[1] 119[114] *al.* The clause is, however, worded less definitely than is probable; and no doubt we must read either, with 𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙 Sam. Ew. Di. Marti, יהיו ("let *them* be") for יהי, or, with Kamp. (who observes that the *fem.* סתרה does not occur elsewhere), סִתְרָם for סִתְרָה

37. חסיו] G-K. § 75 R.[4].—**38.** יאכלו . . . ישתו] frequent., as v.[16f.]—נסיכם] always elsewhere נֶסֶךְ or נֵסֶךְ, נסיך, except here, meaning only *a prince*.

"let *their* shelter be over you."—**39.** With impassioned eloquence the poet, speaking in Jehovah's name, bids Israel *now*, whatever may have been the case hitherto, recognize, from the impotence of their false gods, His sole divinity, and own that He has the power both to smite and to heal—it is He who has brought Israel to its present extremity, and it is He who is also able, if it so pleases Him, to restore to it its lost prosperity.—*That I, I am he*] the duplication of the pronoun marks the passion and fervour of the speaker: cf. Hos. 5^{14b} Is. $43^{11.25}$ 51^{12} (see the writer's *Isaiah*, pp. 182, 200).—*I am he* (אני הוא)] so Is. 41^{4} $43^{10.13}$ (followed as here by ואין מידי מציל), 46^{4} 48^{12}, and (with *thou*) Ps. 102^{28}†. An emphatic assertion of the personality of Jehovah: "I am *He*," *i.e.* He who *is*—as opposed to the unreal gods of the heathen (v.$^{37f.}$, and the context of the passages in II Isaiah), or to the transitory fabric of the world (Ps. $102^{26f.}$)—the Unseen, yet Omnipresent and Self-consistent, Ruler of the world.—*And there is no god with me*] cf. $4^{35.39}$. Similar monotheistic affirmations are frequent in Deutero-Isaiah: see above, on 6^{4} (p. 91).—*I slay, and make alive*] cf. 1 S. 2^{6} 2 K. 5^{7} Wisd. 16^{13} Tob. 13^{2} (a quotation). The reference is not, of course, to the resurrection of the dead, but (as in the passages quoted) to Jehovah's power to rescue from mortal peril (cf. Hos. 6^{2} 13^{14}; Ps. 16^{10} $30^{4(3)}$ $56^{14(13)}$ 86^{13} Jon. $2^{3.7(2.6)}$).—*I have wounded, and I heal*] cf. Job 5^{18} (ימחץ וידיו תרפינה), Is. 19^{22} 30^{26b} (וּמַחַץ מַכָּתוֹ יִרְפָּא), Hos. 6^{1}.—ואין מידי מציל] Is. 43^{13} Job 10^{7}: cf. Hos. 5^{14b}. Is. 43^{11-13} contains very clear reminiscences of this verse. Though Jehovah has smitten His people with war and other scourges, He will now heal them, and visit their foes with irretrievable disaster.

40–42. In conclusion, Jehovah solemnly promises that He will whet His sword, and grant His people vengeance on their foes.

40 "For I lift up my hand to heaven,
"And say, 'As I live for ever.
41 "'If I whet my glittering sword,
"'And mine hand seize hold on judgment,
"'I will render vengeance to my adversaries,
"'And will recompense them that hate me.

Digitized by Google

42 " 'I will make mine arrows drunk with blood,
" 'And my sword shall devour flesh,
" 'With the blood of the slain and of the captives,
" 'From the long-haired heads of the foe.' "

40. To *lift up the hand* is the gesture of a person taking an oath, intended to imply that he appeals to God as a witness to the truth of his affirmation, and that he is willing to incur the vengeance of Heaven in case he speaks falsely: it is here applied, ἀνθρωποπαθῶς and figuratively, to Jehovah Himself. The same phrase (נָשָׂא יָד) in P and esp. in Ez. (Ex. 6^{8} Nu. 14^{30}; Ez. $20^{5.6.15.23}$ (hence Ps. 106^{26}) $^{28.42}$ 36^{7} 44^{12} 47^{14}†); so הֵרִים יָד Gn. 14^{22}: cf. Dan. 12^{7}; Ex. 17^{16}.—*As I* (אנכי) *live for ever*] an emphatic variation of the usual formula "As I live" (חי אני), Nu. $14^{21.28}$ Jer. 22^{24} 46^{18} Zeph. 2^{9} Is. 49^{18}, and often (17 times) in Ez. (5^{11} $14^{16.18.20}$ &c.)†.—**41.** *My glittering sword* is lit. "the lightning of my sword" (cf. Nah. 3^{3} להב חרב וברק חנית, Hab. 3^{11} לנגה ברק חניתך, Ez. $21^{10(15)}$), which here, by a bold poetic figure, is said even to be "whetted." Jehovah is figured as a warrior, arming himself for the fray (cf. Ex. 15^{3} Is. 42^{13} 59^{17}): He "seizes hold" of judgment, as though it were a weapon, lying at His side, and so is ready for the combat with His foes, whose time of triumph over Israel is now drawing to its close. As the context shows, the foes whom the poet has in view are the victorious heathen (v.$^{30-35}$): the sinners in Israel itself (though of course, if pressed, he would not deem them included in the promised salvation) lie, as before (v.^{36}), outside the range of his thoughts.—*Vengeance*] on v.^{35}.—**42.** The figure of v.^{41a} is developed; and Jehovah's vengeance is pictured as accomplished amidst a scene of carnage, such as the Hebrew prophets, esp. the later ones, love to imagine (*e.g.* Is. $34^{5f.}$ 49^{26} 63^{3-6} 66^{16} Jer. 12^{12} 25^{30-33} 46^{10} 50^{25-29}). Clause ^{c} answers to, and completes, clause ^{a}, and clause ^{d} completes similarly clause ^{b} (cf. Is. 49^{2}). The "arrows," which were formerly (v.^{23}) to be exhausted against Israel, will now be directed, with fatal effect, against Israel's foes.—*Devour* (lit. *eat*)] cf. 2 S. 2^{26} 11^{25} Is. 1^{20}.—*Blood of the*

40. ואמַרתי] on the tone, see on 2^{28}.—**41.** שנּוֹתִי irreg. for שַׁנּוֹתִי: cf. Job 19^{17} (see Del.); G-K. § 67 R.[12]—ותאחז] וְ=*so that* (Dr. §§ 61, 62, 138 i. β).—**42.** מדם] מן as Gn. 9^{21} (Is. 51^{21}).—שביה] 21^{11}.—מראש פרעות אויב] פֶּרַע is *flowing locks*

Digitized by Google

slain] Nu. 23^{24} 2 S. 1^{22}.—*And the captives*] an allusion to the custom of slaughtering prisoners after the victory,—a trait meant to exemplify the completeness of the vengeance.—*Long-haired heads*] alluding either to the exuberant vigour and pride of Israel's wild assailants, or perhaps (W.R.S. in Black's *Judges* in the *Smaller Camb. Bible* for Schools, p. 39) to their being as warriors consecrated to their sanguinary work, the unshorn locks being the mark of a vow: cf. Ps. 68^{21}.—Another rendering (cf. below) is "From *the chief of the leaders* of the foe," *i.e.* from the king, the "slain" and the "captives" being the common soldiers.

43. The conclusion to the Song, corresponding to the exordium, v.$^{1-3}$.

> [43] Sing joyously, O nations, of his people:
> For he will avenge the blood of his servants,
> And will render vengeance to his adversaries,
> And clear from guilt his land, his people [Sam. 𝔊𝔗: his people's land].

The nations are invited to congratulate Israel on possessing a God like Jehovah (33^{26} Ps. 144^{15}), who will thus effectually take up His people's cause. Such an invitation, addressed to the nations (cf. Is. 42^{10-12} Ps. $47^{2(1)}$ 67^{1-7} *al.*), involves implicitly the prophetic truth that God's dealings with Israel have, indirectly, an interest and importance for the world at large. With clause ^{b} comp. v.$^{30a-b}$, with clause ^{c} v.^{41c}. From the terms in which the nations generally are here addressed, it follows, as Kamp. remarks, that the "adversaries" who are threatened with vengeance are not the heathen in general, but a particular people hostile to Israel.—*Avenge the blood of his servants*] cf. 2 K. 9^7 (in a Deut. insertion, v.$^{7-10a}$: see *L.O.T.*

Nu. 6^5 Ez. 44^{20}† (cf. the verb Lev. 10^6 *al.*); hence the rend. (פרעה=פֶּרַע) *long-haired heads* (Schult., *Opp. Min.* p. 159, Kn., Ke., W. R. Smith, who renders similarly Jud. 5^2 "for that flowing locks were worn in Israel." Those who render *leaders* (Schultz, Kamp. Di. Oettli: cf. 𝔊 ἀρχόντων) compare the Arab. *fara'a*, to *surpass, excel, far'*, a *prince, noble*: for the *fem.*, of an office, see G-K. § 122. 4^b. AV. (following Ḳimchi) has "revenges," which is based upon the common sense of פרע in Aram.; but it yields here an unsuitable sense.—**43.** הרנינו גוים עמו] הרנין means elsewhere (*a*) *cause to shout* Ps. 65^9 Job 29^{13}; (*b*) *shout* Ps. 32^{11} (absol.) 81^2 (with ל)†. "Cause his people to shout, O ye nations," is not, however, a probable rend.; and "Shout, O ye nations, his people" (Aq. Theod. J. D. Mich.

Digitized by Google

p. 186), Ps. 79^{10}.—*And will clear from guilt* (21^{8}) *his land, his people*] viz. by slaying those who have polluted it, whether by shedding innocent blood in its midst (21^{8} Nu. 35^{33}), or by practising in it idolatry and other abominations (Lev. $18^{25.\,28}$). The ἀσύνδετον "his land, his people" (אדמתו עמו) is, however, hard and unnatural; no doubt "the land of his people" (אדמת עמו) should be read with Sam. 𝔊𝔙 Klost. Dillm. Oettli, Marti. According to the context, the reference will be to the heathen adversaries, who have massacred innocent Israelites, and committed other excesses in the land (comp. Joel $4\,(3)^{19.\,21}$); but it is possible, in the concluding words of his poem, that the poet may mean his words to be understood more generally, and to include a reference to the defilements wrought by the sins of Israel itself. Upon this view, the poem will end appropriately with the thought of Israel freed not only from the calamities which it has so long endured, but also from its sin (cf. Is. $1^{27f.}$ 4^{4} 33^{24} &c.), and so restored completely to Jehovah's favour.

44. Concluding notice respecting the Song.—The verse forms the conclusion, corresponding to the introduction $31^{16\text{-}22}$. It is tautologous with 31^{30} (D), but is the natural sequel of 31^{22}: 31^{22} states how Moses *wrote* the Song, 32^{44} how he *recited* it before the people. 𝔊 makes this reference clear by repeating 31^{22} before 32^{44}.—*And Moses came*] viz. from where he was when he received the instructions $31^{16\text{-}21}$, or "wrote" the Song 31^{22}. "Came and spake" (as Klost. *Pent.* pp. 249–251 points out) implies that some instructions or information had previously been given elsewhere: cf. Gn. 47^{1} (see 46^{29}), Ex. 19^{7} (see v.^{3}), 24^{3} (see 20^{21}).—*This song*] $31^{19.\,21.\,22}$.—*Hoshea'*] prob. a textual error for *Joshua'*, as is read by Sam. 𝔊𝔙𝔖 (Klost. p. 249 f.): Joshua' is called Hoshea' only in Nu.

Ew.) either requires גוים to be taken in the very improbable sense of the two kingdoms of Israel (Ew.), or introduces abruptly the thought of the nations now become God's people (J. D. Mich.), which, though suitable elsewhere (*e.g.* Ps. $47^{10\,(9)}$), is alien to the present context. It is best therefore to suppose that הרנין is construed as רנן (Ps. 51^{16} 59^{17}), and to treat עמו as the object of the verb. 𝔊 (which expands this verse into 8 lines) has μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ (so Rom. 15^{10}), either rendering freely, or reading עם עמו: but the Massoretic text yields a more forcible and appropriate sense.

Digitized by Google

13$^{8.16}$ (P), all the Pentateuchal sources using otherwise uniformly the name Joshua'.

45–47. Moses' final exhortation to Israel to obey the Deuteronomic law.—The passage is not connected with v.^{44}. It contains many Deuteronomic expressions; and its literary affinities are with 31$^{28-29}$, not with 31$^{16-22}$ or 32^{44}.—**45.** וַיְכַל . . . לְ] 20^{9} 26^{12} 31^{24}.—*All these words*] *i.e.* the Deuteronomic discourses. Dillm. Oettli, Westphal, however, suppose v.$^{45-47}$ to have formed the close of the same final hortatory address, to which they conjecture 31$^{24-29}$ to have been the introduction (on 31^{28}); and refer *all these words* (as in 31^{28}) to that.—*All Israel*] 1^{1}.—**46.** *Set your heart to*] i.e. *give heed to*, *pay attention to* (*νοῦν προσέχειν*), the *heart* being the organ of understanding (4^{29}): so 1 S. 9^{20} Ez. 40^{4}; Ex. 9^{21} 1 S. 25^{25} (sq. אֶל); cf. (with שִׁית) Ex. 7^{23} 2 S. 13^{20} *al.*—*Wherewith I testify against you*] see 2 K. 17^{15} Neh. 9^{34}. Not *unto* (RV.): God's law is viewed as a testimony *against* human sin (cf on 4^{45}). Comp. the absol. use of the verb in emphatic or earnest protestation, in popular language Gn. 43^{3} 1 K. 2^{42}, and in a religious sense Jer. 11^{7} Ps. 50^{7} 81^{9}.—*This day*] 8^{19} and often (on 4^{8}).—*That* (4^{10}) *ye may lay them as a charge upon your children, for them to observe to do* (5^{1}) *all the words of this law* (28^{58})] the verse inculcates, not attention to the Deut. law, as such, but the duty of impressing upon the rising generation (cf. 6^{7} 11^{19} 31^{13}), for practical purposes, the exhortations accompanying it.—**47.** *For that is not a thing too empty for you*] the Deut. law is not something unworthy of your regard, not something so destitute of moral force and value that you can afford to put it aside with disdain. On the contrary, it is *your life*,—the foundation of your moral and material well-being (30^{20}; see on 4^{1}).—*And through this thing ye shall prolong days, &c.*] the natural Deuteronomic sequel of "your life": cf. 30^{20} and on 4^{26}.—*Whither ye are passing over, &c.*] 4^{26}: similarly 6^{1} and frequently.

48–52. Moses is commanded to ascend Mount Nebo, and view Canaan, before he dies.—This passage belongs to P, the marks of whose style (see the notes) are unmistakable. It is a duplicate, somewhat expanded, of Nu. 27$^{12-14}$, which is intro-

Digitized by Google

ductory to P's account of the institution of Joshua (Nu. 27^{15-23}), as the present passage is to P's account of the death of Moses, contained in parts of c. 34. The additional matter consists principally of more particular instructions relative to Moses' ascent of Nebo.

Whether the duplication is to be attributed to P himself, is uncertain: the repetition of a *command* is not in his usual manner (cf. Dillm. p. 179). At the same time, in the original priestly document (before its combination with JE and Dt.), the command of Nu. 27^{12-14} will have been separated from the narrative of its execution in Dt. 34 by Nu. 28–31, parts of Nu. 32, Nu. 33–36 Dt. 1^{3}; and a repetition of its terms, with more particular instructions to Moses, may have been deemed, under these circumstances, not unsuitable (cf. Wellh. *Comp.* p. 115). This is the simplest supposition. According to others, the duplication is due to a later hand, the motive for it being the distance by which, when P was broken up for the purpose of being combined with JE and Dt., Nu. 27^{12-14} was separated from the narrative of Moses' death in Dt. 34. Thus Dillm. conjectures that Dt. 32^{48-52} originally stood where Nu. 27^{12-14} stands now, and that it was removed to its present position, as an introduction to c. 34, at the final redaction of the Pent., an abridgment, sufficient as an introduction to Nu. 27^{15-23}, being placed instead of it at Nu. 27^{12-14}: Bacon (*Triple Tradition*, pp. 239 f., 268) thinks Dt. 32^{48-52} an expansion of Nu. 27^{12-14}, inserted by a later priestly hand, for the same purpose, before c. 34.

48. *On this self-same day* (בעצם היום הזה)] a standing expression of P's (Gn. 7^{13} $17^{23.\ 26}$ &c.): see *L.O.T.* p. 124, No. 12. The "day" referred to will be that named in 1^{3} (also P), which is probably to be regarded as identical with the one to which P refers the laws stated by him to have been given in the Steppes of Moab, Nu. 33^{50}–36^{13}.—**49.** *Go up to this mountain of the 'Abārim*] *verbatim* as Nu. 27^{12}. The "mountains of the 'Abārim, in front of Nebo" are mentioned also Nu. $33^{47f.}$ (P), as the last station of the Israelites before they reached the "Steppes of Moab" (on 34^{1}). Comp. Jer. 22^{20}. The name —properly, no doubt, meaning, "of the parts beyond"— appears to have been applied to the range of mountains "beyond" (*i.e.* East of) Jordan, in which Nebo formed a particular ridge. *'Iyê* (ruins of) *'Abārim* was the name of a station of the Israelites in the high ground S.E. of Moab (Nu. 21^{11} 33^{44}).—*Unto Mount Nebo . . . fronting Jericho*] these words are not in Nu. 27^{12}. See on 34^{1}.—*In the land of Moab*] there is no occasion to attribute these words to a different source;

Digitized by Google

for though P speaks habitually of Israel as *encamped* in the "Steppes of Moab" (on 34^1), Nebo was not situated in the Jordan valley, so that some more general expression would naturally have to be employed.—*And see, &c.*] nearly as Nu. 27^{12b}. Here (as also v.[52]) אני is used for "I," as regularly in P (*L.O.T.* p. 127, No. 25): Dt. uses as regularly the other form אנכי (12^{30}, phil. n.).—*Which I am giving to*] exactly as Lev. 14^{34} 23^{10} 25^2 Nu. 13^2 15^2 (P).—*For a possession* (לַאֲחֻזָּה)] as Lev. 14^{34}, and often in P (*L.O.T.* p. 125, No. 22). D in a similar sentence would use אנכי for אני, and would end with "for an inheritance" (לְנַחֲלָה) instead of "for a possession": see 4^{21} 19^{10} 20^{16} 21^{23} 24^4 26^1.—**50.** *And die, &c.*] Nu. 27^{13}, though more briefly expressed, agrees with this verse in substance.—*And be gathered to thy father's kin*] a standing phrase of P's (Gn. 25^8 35^{29} Nu. $20^{24.26}$ 27^{13} 31^2 *al.*); not found in any other writer (*L.O.T.* p. 126, No. 25 *b*). On the rend. *father's kin*, see below.—*In Hor the mountain*] so (in this unusual order) always; see Nu. 20^{22-27} 21^{4a} 33^{37-41}† (all P). The site is uncertain, the identification with Jebel Nebi Hārûn, a little SW. of Petra, being very doubtful: see Dillm. on Nu. 20^{22}; Trumbull, *Kadesh-barnea*, p. 128 ff. (who thinks of Jebel Madura, some 50 miles NW. of Edom); Buhl, *Gesch. der Edomiter*, p. 22 f.—**51.** *Because ye brake faith with me, &c.*] Nu. 27^{14a} agrees in substance, and partly in expression. מָעַל *to break faith* (RV. *trespass*) is a word belonging chiefly to the priestly phraseology, and found mostly in P, Ezek., and Chr.: see *e.g.* Lev. $5^{15.21}$ (6^2) Nu. 31^{16} Jos. 7^1 (P), 22^{16} (*L.O.T.* p. 127, No. 43; p. 503, No. 3).—*Midst* (תוך)] as regularly in P (who rarely uses the syn. קֶרֶב, which D prefers: cf. on 1^{42}).—*The waters of Meribath-Ḳadesh* (the *contention of Ḳadesh*)] so Nu. 27^{14b} (P), Ez. 47^{19} 48^{28}: cf. *the waters of Meribah*, Nu. $20^{13.24}$ (P), Dt. 33^8 Ps. 81^8 106^{32}†.—*The wilderness of Ẓin*] a designation used only by P (Nu. 13^{21}

50. עמים] in Arab. *'am* is *patruus* and *patrueles*; in Heb. it commonly means *people*. It seems that the orig. meaning of the word was *father's kin*, retained in Heb. in the two phrases *be gathered to*, and *cut off from*, one's עמים, but usu. in Heb. widened to *people*, while in Arab. it was narrowed to *father's brother*, and *father's brother's children*. Cf. Wellh. in the Göttingen *Nachrichten*, 1893, p. 480.

Digitized by Google

20^{1} $27^{14.\,14}$ 33^{36} 34^{3} Jos. 15^{1}†; cf. Ẓin, Nu. 34^{4} Jos. 15^{3}†). The site of Ẓin is unknown; but the use of the expression shows that the "wilderness of Ẓin" must have been a name for the country round, or near, Ḳadesh (cf. Nu. 33^{36}; and see on 1^{2}).—*Sanctified me not*] or *treated me not as holy*, viz. by paying Me the honour and respect which are My due: cf. Nu. 20^{12} 27^{14}. The word is prob. chosen on account of its assonance with *Ḳadesh*. Plays on words are rare in P; but they occur occasionally, *e.g.* Gn. $17^{5.\,17}$ Nu. 18^{2} 20^{13} ("contended").—**52.** To this verse nothing corresponds in Numbers.—*Thou shalt see the land from a distance* (מִנֶּגֶד)] lit. *from in front* (28^{66}): cf. 2 K. 2^{15} ("saw him *from a distance*"), 3^{22} 4^{25} (RV. "afar off"). "Before thee" (AV., RV.) is not a good rendering.

XXXIII. The Blessing of Moses.—The Blessing of Moses consists of a series of benedictions, or eulogies, pronounced upon the different tribes (Simeʿon excepted), v.$^{6-25}$, with an Exordium v.$^{2-5}$, and a conclusion v.$^{26-29}$. The aim of the blessing is to signalize some distinctive feature in the character, or occupation, or geographical situation of each tribe, with allusion, by preference, to the *theocratic* function discharged by it; and at the same time to celebrate the felicity, material and spiritual, of the nation as a whole, secured to it originally by Jehovah's goodness in the wilderness (v.$^{2-5}$), and maintained afterwards, by a continuance of His protecting care, in its home in Canaan (v.$^{26-29}$). In general character, it resembles the Blessing of Jacob (Gn. 49^{1-27}); but there are several more or less noteworthy points of difference. (1) It has an exordium and conclusion, distinct from the separate blessings, in which the prominent thought is the relation of the nation as a whole to Jehovah, and its manifold indebtedness to His bounty; (2) the blessings are wholly eulogistic (contrast Gn. $49^{5-7.\,14-15}$); (3) the subject of a blessing is often some feature of a *theocratic* character (v.$^{8-10.\,12.\,19.\,21d\text{-}e.\,26-27.\,29}$), especially such as originated, or were secured to Israel, in the Mosaic age (v.$^{2-5.\,8-10.\,16.\,21.\,27c\text{-}d}$): in Gn. 49 the *secular* relations of the tribes are far more prominent, and there is no reference to the circumstances of the Mosaic age; (4) the tribe of Simeʿon is unnoticed; (5) each blessing, except the first (v.^{6}),

Digitized by Google

is introduced separately by the narrator, speaking in his own person (as v.^{8} "And of Levi he said . . ."). Compared, as a whole, with the Blessing of Jacob, the Blessing of Moses may be said to be pitched in a higher key; the tone is more buoyant; the affluence, or other distinctive character, of the various tribes is portrayed in more glowing colours: ease, tranquillity, and contentment are the predominant characteristics of the age.* The most salient features are the isolation and depression of Judah (the notice of which, v.^{7}, is brief, and very unlike the warm eulogy of Gn. $49^{8\text{-}12}$), the honour and respect with which Levi is viewed (contrast the minatory tone of Gn. $49^{5\text{-}7}$), the strength and splendour of the double tribe of Joseph, v.$^{13\text{-}17}$, and the burst of grateful enthusiasm with which the poet celebrates the fortune of his nation, settled and secure, with the aid of its God, in its Palestinian home (v.$^{26\text{-}29}$). Reminiscences of Gn. 49 appear in v.$^{13\text{-}16.\,22}$ (see the notes).

Date of the Blessing. The Blessing contains more than one indication that it is not Mosaic. It is incredible that v.^{4a} ("Moses commanded *us* a law") could have been written by Moses; and even though (as is done by Volck, p. 45; Delitzsch, *ZKWL.* 1880, p. 508) v.^{4} be rejected as a gloss, there remain other traits which it is difficult to reconcile with his authorship. V.$^{27.\,28}$ look back to the conquest of Palestine as *past* ("*And he drave out* the enemy from before thee, *and said,* Destroy; so Israel *dwelt* securely upon a land of corn and wine," &c.);† v.$^{12.\,19\text{-}23}$ describe *special* geographical or other circumstances (v.^{21} the part taken by Gad in the conquest of Canaan), with a particularity not usual when the prophets are declaring the future; and the silence respecting

* Contrast for instance v.$^{8\text{-}11}$ (Levi, Jehovah's faithful minister) with Gn. $49^{5\text{-}7}$ (Levi reproached for its violence, and scattered in Israel for a punishment); v.^{12} (Benjamin dwelling in tranquillity under Jehovah's shelter) with Gn. 49^{27} (Benjamin a wolf, ever active in the pursuit of prey); v.^{17} (Joseph an unassailable military power) with Gn. 49^{23} (Joseph, though maintaining his position, sorely beset by foes); v.$^{18\text{-}19}$ (Issachar happy in its peaceful country life) with Gn. $49^{14f.}$ (Issachar mocked for its indolence and slavish submissiveness to the foreigner).

† These tenses cannot be naturally understood as "prophetic" pasts: cf. Dr. § 82, with the *Obs.*

Digitized by Google

Sime'on presupposes a period, when (as was certainly not the case till considerably after the Mosaic age: cf. Jud. 1[3]) the tribe was absorbed in Judah. Nevertheless, though not Mosaic, the Blessing is certainly ancient, though it is difficult to fix the date precisely, the historical allusions of the poem being either indefinite or obscure, and hence affording room for divergent conclusions. The Blessing presupposes a period when Reuben had dwindled in numbers, and Sime'on had ceased to exist as an independent tribe, when the tribe of Levi was warmly respected (v.[8-11]), when the Temple had been built, and was regarded with affection by the pious worshippers of Jehovah (v.[12]), when Ephraim was flourishing and powerful (v.[13-16. 17]), and Zebulun and Issachar commercially prosperous (v.[19c-d]); Judah, on the contrary (v.[7]), would seem to have been in some difficulty or need, and (see the note) severed from the rest of Israel. The circumstances of the nation must have been very different from those under which the Song 32[1-43] was composed: no trace of idolatry, or of Israel's declension from its ideal; no foes, threatening Israel with ruin,—at most the allusions to local or contingent troubles in v.[6b. 7c-d. 11c-d]; no word of censure or reproach: v.[27-29] may be said to be parallel to 32[13-14], but on all the melancholy history that follows (32[15ff.]) the Blessing is silent. It breathes the bright and happy spirit of the earlier narratives of Kings (as distinguished from the Deuteronomic additions made by the compiler). The periods to which the criteria just noted have generally been considered to point, are either one shortly after the rupture under Jerobo'am I.,* or the middle and prosperous part (cf. 2 K. 14[25]) of the reign of Jerobo'am II. (*c.* 780 B.C.):†

* Schrader, *Einl.* § 204; Dillm.; Westphal, ii. 50.

† Graf, pp. 79–82; Bleek, *Einl.* § 127; Kuenen, *Hex.* § 13. 16; Reuss, *La Bible*, ii. 360 f.; Stade, *Gesch.* i. 150, 152; Cornill, § 13. 6; similarly Baudissin, *Priesterthum*, pp. 74 f., 266. Ew. (*Hist.* i. 128) assigned the Blessing to the age of Josiah. Kleinert (pp. 169–175: so König, *Einl.* p. 202 f.) assigns it to the close of the period of the Judges, when Judah also played a part distinct from the other tribes, and was relatively much less prominent; v.[12] he refers to the territory of Benjamin generally, observing that all the principal places named at this time as religious centres (Bethel, Gilgal, Miẓpah, Nob) were within its borders. Riehm (*Einl.* i. 313) places it during the rivalry of the two kingdoms of David

Digitized by Google

the intermediate period is improbable on account of the Syrian wars (cf. p. 346); and a date later than the age of Jeroboʿam would be unsuitable on account of the anarchy and unsettlement which ensued in Israel after his death, and the deportation of the N. and E. tribes by Tiglath-Pileser in B.C. 734 (2 K. 15²⁹). There seems to be no sufficient reason why the first of these dates should not be accepted: * under Jeroboʿam II., Israel had too recently recovered itself, and its prosperity (see Amos, *passim*) was too superficial, to be contemplated by a prophet of Jehovah with the admiration and satisfaction which the Blessing displays. The sympathy shown for the Northern tribes, and especially the glowing eulogy bestowed upon Joseph,—while Judah is dismissed in a few words, with the wish that it may be united to the nation generally,—is an indication that the poet represents the *Ephraimite* point of view, and that he belongs to the Northern kingdom.† It is most probable that the Blessing was intended from the first to pass under Moses' name: if this was the case, it will be most natural to suppose that (like the poetical utterances placed in Balaʿam's mouth in Nu. 22–24) it was the poetical development of an ancient popular tradition,‡ which, as it took shape in the poet's breast, received in parts the stamp of the age in which he lived; and the aim of which (Dillm. p. 416) was "to rally the nation anew around the banner of the Mosaic institutions, and to awaken in it a

and Ishbosheth (2 S. 2–4: with v.⁷ cf. 2 S. 5¹ᶠ·); Oettli, p. 23, inclines to the same view.

* Unless, indeed, the familiar use of the term *covenant* (v.⁹ᵇ) presupposes a later age (cf. on 4¹³).

† Cf. Westphal, ii. 50, "Le verset 7 ne s'explique parfaitement que si la pièce à laquelle il appartient a été écrite au lendemain même du Schisme des dix tribus, en ces temps à la fois prospères et douloureux, où les deux moitiés de l'héritage de David souhaitaient encore de se rejoindre. La forme du vœu,—qui n'est point la plus naturelle, puisque c'est Israel qui s'est separé de Juda,—montre assez que l'auteur de la pièce est un homme du royaume du Nord. On sent d'ailleurs aussi frémir, dans les derniers mots de la bénédiction de Lévi, le ressentiment que l'Israël fidèle éprouvait contre les institutions impies de Jéroboam I. (comp. 1 Rois xii, surtout le verset 31)." Cf. the note on v.⁷.

‡ Westphal, ii. 48: "L'amplification poétique d'un souvenir ancien dans la tradition populaire."

Digitized by Google

fresh and vivid consciousness of the happiness implied in its being Jehovah's people."

The Blessing contains several words or forms, not occurring elsewhere (two or three due prob. to a corrupt text): v.^{2} אשרת (?), v.^{3} חבב, תכו, דברות, v.^{5} התאסף (elsewhere the Nif. נאסף), v.^{10} קטורה (elsewhere קטרת), v.^{11} מן as conj., v.^{12} חפף, v.^{14} גרש, v.^{19} שפע, שפון, v.^{22} זנק, v.^{23} ירשה, v.^{25} מנעל (elsewhere מנעול), דבא. Rare words are v.^{4} קהלה (usually קהל), v.$^{5.26}$ ישורון, v.$^{13-16}$ מגד, v.^{28} ערף. Of these חבב, זנק, שפע, and מגד have an Aramaic, or (מגד) North-Israelitish, tinge.

As to the manner in which the Blessing was incorporated into Dt., nothing definite can be said. Dillm. and Cornill (§ 13. 6) think that it formed part of E; Bacon (*Triple Tradition*, p. 269 ff.) argues in favour of its having belonged to J; but the arguments on both sides are slight and inconclusive. It displays no literary connexion with the narrative of either c. 31–32 or c. 34: the sole noteworthy points of contact with the Song in c. 32 are *Jeshurun* v.$^{5.26}$, ערף v.^{28d}, and the figure in v.^{29e} (see 32$^{15a.2a.13a}$); in general style and tone it differs from it completely. Nor do reminiscences, or other traces of its influence, appear in the discourses of Dt.: hence it is quite possible that it was incorporated from an independent source—perhaps a collection of ancient national hymns—after the book had, in other respects, reached its present form. The question is not, critically, one of importance.

As regards the *order* of the tribes, the series is opened naturally by the first-born, Reuben; in Gn. 49 Reuben is followed, in order of seniority, by Sime'on, Levi, Judah, and then by the two younger Leah-tribes, Issachar and Zebulun: here (Sime'on being omitted) Judah precedes Levi,—on account, doubtless, of its political prominence; the two Raḥel-tribes, Benjamin and Joseph (which in Gn. 49, as Jacob's youngest sons, come last, in the opposite order) precede Zebulun and Issachar,—in view, no doubt, of their superior theocratic or political importance, Benjamin standing first on account of the Temple; and the series is closed by Gad, Dan, Naphtali, Asher, the two Bilhah (Raḥel's handmaid)-tribes coming between the two Zilpah (Leah's handmaid)-tribes.

Monographs on the Blessing: K. H. Graf, *Der Segen Mose's*, 1857; W. Volck, *Der Segen Mose's*, 1873: see also Stade, *Gesch.* i. 150–172.

XXXIII. 1. Superscription.—*The man of God*] so, of Moses, Jos. 14^{6} Ps. 90 *title*†. Frequently of prophets (1 S. 2^{27} 9^{6} 1 K. 12^{22} 13$^{1ff.}$ 2 K. 4–8 (oft.), &c.), or messengers of God (Jud. 13$^{6.8}$).—*Before his death*] Gn. 27^{7} 50^{16} 1 Ch. 22^{5}.

2–5. Exordium. How Jehovah, revealing Himself majestically to His people in the desert, gave them a law through Moses, and secured for the tribes, united under His sovereignty, the possession of Canaan.

XXXIII. 1. 'אשר ברך וג] the double accus., as 12^{7} 15^{14} (G-K. § 117. 5^{a}; Dav. §§ 75^{b}, 78 R^{3}).

Digitized by Google

2 Jehovah came from Sinai,
And beamed forth unto them from Se'ir;
He shone forth from Mount Paran,
And approached out of holy myriads;
From his right hand was a [burning] fire for them.
3 Yea, he had affection for the peoples [𝔊: his people];
All its holy ones were in thy hand:
And they [followed] at thy foot,
Receiving of thy words.
4 A law Moses commanded for us
A possession (for) the assembly of Jacob.
5 And he became king in Jeshurun
When the heads of the people were assembled,
All together the tribes of Israel.

2. It is not said that Jehovah came *to* Sinai, but that He came *from* it; hence the verse cannot relate to the delivery of the law, when Jehovah "came down *upon* Sinai" (Ex. $19^{18.\,20}$), but describes, under grand poetic imagery, how from spots bordering on the wilderness of the wanderings, Jehovah had displayed Himself gloriously to His people, assisting them with His presence, and guiding them on their journey to Canaan. Cf. the theophanies described in Jud. $5^{4f.}$ (whence, with variations, Ps. $68^{8f.\,(7f.)}$), Hab. $3^{3ff.}$ Ps. $77^{16\text{-}20}$. Sinai, which is already called the "mount of God" in Ex. 3^1 (cf. 19^3), must, it seems, have been a sacred spot before the Israelites made it their halting-place (cf. Wellh. *Hist.* p. 343 f.; W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.* p. 110 f., ed. 2, 1894, p. 117 f.). The majestic mountain ranges on the other side of the great desert, which stretched as far as the eye could reach on the S. of Canaan, impressive both for their solitude (*S. & P.* p. 12 f.) and for their savage grandeur, appear to have been regarded by the Israelites, before the establishment of the sanctuary on Ẓion, as Jehovah's earthly dwelling-place, whence He issued forth for the defence or guidance of His people.—*Sinai*] D always speaks of *Ḥoreb* (1^6).—*Beamed forth* (זרח)] viz. as the

2. מימינו] מן may express either *out of*, *from*, or *off, on the side of*=*at* (Ps. 16^8 and oft.): the former is more suitable here.—אשדת] so Mass., with the note כתיב חד וקרי תרין, *i.e.* to be written as one word, and read as two (אֵשׁ דָּת). דת, for the reason stated above, cannot be correct: hence we are driven to conclude that the text is corrupt. Most of the suggestions that have been made are, however, questionable philologically: so אֲשֵׁרָת (Graf) *support*, viz. for Israel (cf. Aram. אֻשַּׁרְתָּא=Heb. יְרוּת; 1 K. 7^{32} 10^{12}), אֲשֵׁרוֹת

rising sun, illumining the horizon with the splendour of its rays. This is what זרח always denotes: cf. זרח ל Gn. 32[32 (31)]; and fig., as here, of Jehovah, Mal. 3[20]: so זרח על Is. 60[1. 2].—*Unto them*] viz. the persons whom the poet has in his mind (Is. 13[2] 33[2]; Nah. 1[8] "*its* place"), *i.e.* here the people of Israel.—*From Se'ir*] *i.e.* from Edom (p. 6). The mention of Edom—a country generally so hostile to Israel—as a place whence Jehovah manifests Himself for the salvation of His people, is remarkable; but it recurs in Deborah's Song, Jud. 5[4] ("Jehovah, when thou camest forth *from Se'ir*, when thou marchedst *from the field of Edom*"), and in the Ode of Habaḳḳuḳ, Hab. 3[3] ("God came from Teman [a district of Edom], and the Holy One from Mount Paran"); and in Jud. 5[5] the theophanic storm on Sinai appears to be represented not as a consequence of Jehovah's descent from heaven, but as a consequence of His issuing forth from Edom. Were we better acquainted than we are with the ancient religion of Edom, the reason for this representation might be apparent. —*Shone forth* (הופיע)] Ps. 50[2] (from Ẓion), 80[2] 94[1]: the thought also as Hab. 3[4] ונגה כאור תהיה.—*From Mount Paran*] or (collect.) *the mountains of Paran*: so Hab. 3[3] (just quoted). The data at our disposal do not enable us to fix with confidence the locality intended (cf. p. 4): by some (Schultz, Keil, Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 510, cf. pp. 288 f., 339, 344 f.) it is identified with Jebel Mugrah, a height of some 2000 ft., about 29 miles S. of 'Ain Ḳadis, 50 miles W. of Edom, and 130 N. of Sinai, forming the S. part of the mountain plateau, now inhabited by the Azāzimeh Arabs; by others (Delitzsch on Hab. 3[3], Volck) with the range of hills extending in a N.E. direction from Sinai, along the W. side of the Aelanitic Gulf,

(Friedr. Del. *ZKWL.* 1882, p. 342, tentatively) *standing-places* (from the Assyr.), אֲשֵׁרוֹת (Ew. Knob.) *lightning-flashes* (Aram. אשר *to pour forth*, but not spec. of light), אֶשְׁדָת (Bö. Ke.) *fire shot forth* (of lightning, lit. *fire of throwing*, from אֵשׁ and שְׁדָת from Aram. שרי *to throw*, Heb. שְׁרִה in the n. pr. שְׁדֵיאוּר Nu. 1[5] 2[10]), a sense which Ges. seeks to extract from MT., by treating דָּת as contr. from יְרָת, from ירה *to throw*. Dillm., observing that the idea of *lightning* is best suited to the context, proposes either אֵשׁ [לַפִּ]דֹת (Ex. 20[18]) or אֵשׁ [יֹקֶ]דֶת; these are by far the best proposals that have been made, the latter (as the f. pl. of לפיד is not found except as a n. pr.) being the preferable one.

Digitized by Google

towards Edom. The latter range of mountains appears to be the loftier and more imposing (cf. Hull, *Mount Seir, Sinai*, &c. pp. 55–61), if such characteristics may be presumed to have determined its selection in the present connexion. And *Ēl of Paran*, if this be rightly identified with Elath (2^8), at the head of the Aelanitic Gulf (cf. Dillm. on Gn. 14^6), would seem to connect Paran somewhat intimately with that neighbourhood.—*Approached* (אָתָה)] אתה is the Aram. synonym of בא *to come* (cl. [a]), found sometimes in Heb. poetry (v.[21] Is. 21^{12} Jer. 3^{22} *al.*). *Approached* is adopted merely to avoid the repetition of the same word *came*.—*Out of holy myriads*] *i.e.* from His abode in heaven, where He sits enthroned, surrounded by angelic hosts (1 K. 22^{19} Ps. 89^7 Dan. 7^{10} *al.*). But the sense thus produced is here unsatisfactory; and it is very doubtful if the text is correct.

A periphrasis for *heaven* is not a probable parallel to *Sinai*, *Se'ir*, and *Paran*; and the thought of Jehovah's coming forth *from* His heavenly abode (Mic. 1^3) should *precede* the three earthly localities: moreover, the angel hosts would be more naturally pictured as *accompanying* their Sovereign (Zech. 14^5 Ps. $68^{18\,(17)}$), than as left behind by Him in heaven. 𝔊 (for *holy*) has Καδης; whence Ew. (*Hist.* ii. 198; *Jahrb. Bibl. Wiss.* iii. 234), Dillm. read ממריבת קדש "from Meribath-Ḳadesh (32^{51}), to which Oettli also inclines; Böttcher, *Neue Ährenl.* (less probably) מֵעַרְבֹת קדש "from the steppes (34^8) of Ḳadesh"; Wellh. (*Hist.* p. 344) מריבת קדש "and came *to* Meribath-Ḳadesh." Ḳadesh (as its name implies) was an ancient sanctuary, and for long a resting-place of the Israelites (1^{46}: cf. p. 32 f.), though details of their sojourn there are not preserved in our present Pentateuch. Its mention here would thus not in itself be unsuitable: though the geographical character of Ḳadesh—a recess in a low limestone range, rising out of the plain (p. 6)—in view of the fact that Jehovah's theophanies are habitually associated with great mountain regions, does not lend probability to the idea of a theophany *from* it. Wellh.'s reading may thus be worthy of greater consideration than Dillm. (p. 417 f.) is disposed to give to it; for, to judge from its other name (Gn. 14^7) *'En-Mishpaṭ*, "Spring of judgment," contending parties sought at Ḳadesh authoritative settlement of their disputes; hence it is quite possible that tradition may have connected part of Moses' legislative activity with the period of Israel's sojourn there. Other slight emendations, deviating less from the existing text, and none unsuitable to the context, would be בְּרִבְבֹת for מֵרִבְבֹת (cf. p. 31 *n.*) "and came *with* holy myriads"; וְאִתּוֹ רבבת קדש "and *with him* (so, for *came*, Sam. 𝔖𝔗𝔙: for the ה, see on 34^7) were holy myriads"; or וְאִתּוֹ מַרְכְּבוֹת קדש (mentioned by Graf), "and with him were holy *chariots*" (cf. Ps. $68^{18\,(17)}$ Hab. 3^{8e}). It is impossible to determine with confidence what the original text was.—The passage, as understood by the Jews (𝔗 "and

Digitized by Google

with him were myriads of holy ones"; cf. 𝔊 in clause [d] ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ), gave rise to the belief that the angels assisted at the delivery of the law, Acts 7^{53} Gal. 3^{19} (see Lightfoot), Heb. 2^{2} Jos. *Ant.* xv. 5. 3 *al.*; cf. Weber, *Altsynag. Theol.* p. 259.

A burning fire for them] the Heb. text has אש דת למו "fire was a law for them." But דת "law" is a *Persian* word, found only in the latest parts of the OT. (Ezr. Est. Dan.): it is next to impossible that it can have been used in Heb. at the time when this Blessing was written. Various emendations have been proposed (see below), of which the most plausible is that of Dillm., here adopted, יְקֹדֶת for דָּת: for the thought, cf. Hab. 3^{4} "He had rays of light (coming forth) from his hand," Ex. 20^{18} Ps. 50^{3}. The theophany is described (as Hab. $3^{3f.}$) as accompanied by a flood of brilliant light.—**3.** The verse, with its many ἅπαξ εἰρημένα, and other difficulties, can hardly be in its original form: as it stands, the general sense expressed by it is Jehovah's loving guidance of Israel, and the instruction which He vouchsafed to give it.—*Had affection for* (חבב)] only here; common in Aram. and Arab. in the sense of *to love*. The thought as $7^{7.8}$ &c.—*His people* (עמו)] so 𝔊 Dillm. Oettli, Marti: cf. the sing. pron. *its* in cl. [b]. The text has *peoples* (עמים). This regularly denotes the heathen nations (so Schultz, Keil), God's regard for which is, however, here entirely foreign to the poet's train of thought.—*Its holy ones*] *i.e.* Israel's, the "holy nation" (Ex. 19^{6}; Dt. 7^{6} $14^{2.21}$ 26^{19}). The pron. can hardly be rendered *his*, on account of the very harsh *enallage*

3. חֹבֵב] the ptcp. without the subj. expressed is defensible (v.^{12}: Dr. § 135. 6; Dav. § 100^{a}); but here, as pff. precede and follow, חָבַב (𝔊𝔖𝔗𝔙, Kn. Di. Oe.) is preferable.—עמים] on the strength of Gn. 28^{3} 48^{4} Jud. 5^{14} Hos. 10^{14}, it has been supposed (Onq. Ibn 'Ezra, Rashi, Graf, Kn. *al.*) that עמים may mean *the tribes* of Israel: but it is very doubtful if the promise that Jacob is to become "a company of *peoples*" (cf. "of nations" Gn. 35^{11}), or Jud. 5^{14} Hos. 10^{14} (where "thy עמים" appears to mean "thy *kinsfolk*": see on 32^{50}), justify the supposition that עמים used absolutely would express this sense.—תֻּכּוּ] would be a pf. Pu. from תכה: but no root תכה is known. De Dieu, Ges. Röd. (in *Thes.*) *al.* render *reclined*, comparing Arab. *'ittaka'a* (viii. conj.) *to lean, recline* (*e.g.* on seats Qor. 18^{30} 43^{33}): but this rend. is very dub.; there is no genuine root *taka'a* in Arabic; *'ittaka'a*, like *'atka'a* (iv.), is a secondary formation from *waka'a* (Freyt. *s.v.*; Lane, p. 2962). Graf, Knob. would read תָּכּוּ, comparing Arab. *thakka* peregrinatus fuit; but ثك should correspond to Heb. שׁ, not ת. Other explanations are still less satis-

Digitized by Google

personae, which would then be involved in the following *thy*. —*Followed*] the rend. is given conjecturally, תכו being in fact a *vox nihili*; see below.—*At thy foot*] *i.e.* at thy guidance (see below): cf. 1^{33} &c.—*Thy words*] *i.e.* commands, laws, &c.—**4.** *Possession* (מוֹרָשָׁה)] otherwise only Ex. 6^{8} (P), and Ez. 11^{15} $25^{4.10}$ 33^{24} $36^{2.3.5}$, of a territorial possession. נַחֲלָה *inheritance* lends itself to fig. uses; and hence a late Psalmist can speak of the law as his נחלה (Ps. 119^{111}): but the metaph. use of מורשה is not probable; and the reference is no doubt to Canaan, of which the cogn. verb ירש is constantly used (Dt. 4^{5} &c.).—*Assembly* (קְהִלָּה)] only Neh. 5^{7}: קָהָל is the usual word ($23^{2\,(1)}$).—**5.** *Became king, &c.*] Jehovah assumed, as it were, the sovereignty over Israel, when the tribes with their leaders (v.[21]) were gathered about Him, on the "day of the assembly" (9^{10} 10^{4} 18^{16}) at Sinai.—*Jeshurun*] the designation shows that Israel is here contemplated under its *ideal* character (32^{15}).—*King*] of God, as Nu. 23^{21}; cf. Jud. 8^{23} Is. 33^{22}. Graf, Wellh. (*Hist.* p. 254), Stade (*Gesch.* i. 177), Reuss, Kuenen (*Hex.* § 13. 16), Cornill, § 13. 6, render "And there was a king," &c., supposing the reference to be to the recognition of Saul as king by united Israel. But this, as Dillm. observes, does not seem to lie in the line of the poet's thought. Cl. [c] leads on appropriately to the notices of the separate tribes, which follow (Di.).

6. Reuben.

Let Reuben live, and not die;
But let his men be few.

---

factory. The Versions, and Jewish authorities, render no help, in most cases merely conjecturing from the context; 𝕲 ὑπὸ σε (as though תחת *for* תכו), 𝔖 מרדכין *followed*, Aq. *percussi* (as though הֻכּוּ), 𝔙 *qui appropinquant pedibus tuis*, Ibn 'Ezra נמשכו, Kimchi ענינו לפי מקומו נתחברו והלכו לרגלך. הלכו, or נסעו, is the idea that is required (see the note on לרגלך): but there is no Heb. word expressing it, which graphically resembles תכו: the corruption, it is evident, is deep-seated.—לרגלך] the ל does not express locality, but is the ל of *norm* (11^{11}), as 1 S. 25^{42} "who went *according to* her foot," *i.e.* attended her wherever she went, Gn. 30^{33} 33^{14} (*acc. to* the foot—*i.e.* pace—of the cattle), Is. 41^{2} (RV. 2nd *m.*), Hab. 3^{5}.—ישא] the "synchronistic" impf., as Is. 42^{14} Jer. 15^{6} 1 S. 18^{5} Ps. 26^{1} (Dr. §§ 34 *end*, 163; Dav. § 141. R.[3]).—מדברותיך] with מן *part.* The form דַּבֶּרֶת (not elsewhere) excites suspicion.—**4.** קהלת] poet. for לקהלת: cf. Is. 28^{6} 48^{14} (G-K. § 119. 5).—**5.** יחד] beginning the clause with emph.: cf. Job 3^{18} 16^{10} 19^{12} *al.*; and יחדו v.[5] Is. $11^{7.14}$ 31^{3} *al.*—**6.** ויהי] the sg., as 32^{35}.—מתיו] on 4^{27}.—מספר] lit. *number* (G-K.

Digitized by Google

The series opens with Reuben, the first-born (Gn. 49^{3}). The blessing is a qualified one, and corresponds with the position actually taken by Reuben in history. The tribe maintained its existence, but was not politically important; and its numbers were probably greatly reduced. It is reproached by Deborah (Jud. $5^{15f.}$) for its indifference in a great national crisis; and many of the cities assigned to it in the "tableland" (המישור) N. of the Arnon (Jos. 13^{18-23}) appear afterwards (see the Inscription of Mesha'; Is. 15–16; Jer. 48) in the possession of Moab. It is rarely referred to in the history. The dwindling numbers, and national insignificance, of the tribe, are reflected in the Blessing; Reuben is to be saved from extinction, but its existence is to be a precarious one.—Sime'on, Leah's second son, who would naturally follow Reuben (as Gn. 49^{5}), is passed by. This, it seems, is to be explained by the fact that Sime'on at an early period was virtually absorbed by the tribe of Judah, in the S.W. of whose territory, about Beer-sheba', its possessions lay: all the Sime'onite cities enumerated in Jos. 19^{1-8} are classed in $15^{26-32. 42}$ as belonging to Judah (cf. also Jos. 19^{9} 1 Ch. $4^{27. 31}$); after the division of the kingdom, Sime'on hardly figures as an independent tribe; nor is a single member of it named as resident in the same cities (Neh. $11^{26ff.}$) after the exile (cf. Ew. *Hist.* ii. 287 f.; Stade, *Gesch.* i. 154 f.). Its early close connexion with Judah is attested by Jud. $1^{3. 17}$. Cod. A and other MSS. of 𝔊 insert *Συμεων* in $cl._{a}^{b}$, rendering (falsely) *καὶ Συμεων ἔστω πολὺς ἐν ἀριθμῷ*; but this is evidently a correction,

§ 141. 2 R[1]; Dr. § 192. 2; Dav. § 29[e]), idiom. for ***numerable, few*** (Is. 10^{19}; Nu. 9^{20}; Dt. 4^{27} *al.*). The qualified blessing has appeared to many to be a difficulty; and attempts have hence been made to extract from the verse a different sense. Thus Graf, Ke. understand the neg. in ואל ימת to rule also the foll. clause (as Ps. 9^{19} 35^{19} 38^{2} 44^{19} 75^{6} 1 S. 2^{3}); but this happens only where the neg. holds the ***principal*** place in the first of two parallel clauses: here it holds a subordinate place, the words ***and not die*** being added to ***Let Reuben live***, merely for the sake of emphasizing that (cf. Ps. 28^{5b} Jer. 2^{27} 18^{7} 21^{10} 24^{6} 42^{10}); the first clause of the verse, therefore, so far from supplying a neg. to determine the second, in reality contains only an ***affirmative*** proposition. † Di. treats ו in ויהי as=*so that* (G-K. § 109. 2[b] R; Dr. § 64; Dav. § 65[c]) "Let Reuben live; and let him not die so that his men be few"; but this rend. destroys the rhythm and symmetry of the verse.

Digitized by Google

made to remove what had the appearance of a difficulty. See further at the end of the note on v.[7] (p. 397 f.).

7. Judah.

> [7] Hear, O Jehovah, the voice of Judah,
> And bring him to his people:
> With his hands he hath contended for it,
> And be thou a help from his adversaries.

The prayer of the first line implies that the tribe desires something—whether release from peril, or success in war, or union with its natural allies—which it has not yet attained (Ps. $18^{7(6)}$ $62^{2(1)}$; cf. Gn. 21^{17} Nu. 20^{16}); the prayer that it may be "brought unto its people" implies that it is separated from them. And the tribe being spoken of as a whole, the "people" to which it is to be brought can only be the rest of Israel. When, however, was Judah, relatively to the rest of Israel, in the situation thus presupposed? And what is the separation alluded to? Onq. paraphrases: "Hear, O Jehovah, the prayer of Judah *when he goeth forth to battle*; and bring him *back* to his people *in peace*"; and the words are explained similarly by Keil and others. But this exegesis is questionable: the limitation expressed in the first italicized clause is not suggested by anything in the text, which implies that Judah is *generally*, at the time contemplated by the poet, in need of assistance. And we at least know nothing from the history of its having been the custom for Judah to fight *on behalf of* the other tribes, and *in separation from* them; Jud. 1^8 20^{18} do not prove it. Judah, during the period of the Judges, so far from having been the champion of the other tribes, appears rather to have held aloof from them, and pursued an independent course of its own: in the Song of Deborah, it is not even named. By many the words have been interpreted as a prayer, uttered from the point of view of an Israelite of the Northern kingdom, for the reunion of Judah and Israel, either (Riehm, *Einl.* i. 313) during the rivalry (2 S. 2–4) between the two kingdoms of David and Ishbosheth, or at some period (see p. 387 f.) after the rupture under Jerobo'am I. (so Ew. *Hist.* i. 128; Graf, p. 28 f.; Wellh. *Hist.* p. 282; Stade, *Gesch.* i. 160; Dillm.; Westphal, ii. 50).

Digitized by Google

Although, from a Judæan point of view (1 K. 12 Is. 7^{17} &c.), the rupture was viewed as a defection of the Northern tribes from the dynasty of David, yet Judah was the smaller unit, and the Northern kingdom retained the national name of "Israel," so that an Ephraimite, who, whether on religious or political grounds, regarded the division as a misfortune, might well speak of Judah as being *brought* to the larger whole, of which it was naturally a part, viz. "its people" Israel.* It is not a decisive objection to this view that *bring back* (תשיבנו) would be used of a *re*union, rather than merely *bring* (תביאנו): see Dt. 30^{5} Ez. 36^{24} 37^{21} *al.* Clause [c] will then allude to the leadership naturally assumed by Judah under David and Solomon: the victorious wars of David (2 S. 8, &c.) might well be described poetically as contests in which the tribe was engaged for the common weal. This is the best explanation of which the words admit: our ignorance of the *exact* circumstances under which the Blessing was composed, naturally precludes us from being confident that it is the correct one. Clause [d], "if it be not meant quite generally, could be readily understood as an allusion to the invasion of Shishaḳ, 1 K. $14^{25f.}$" (Dillm.).—*With his hands, &c.*] justifying the desire for reunion, just expressed, by a reference to Judah's services for the common weal. But יָדֶיךָ רִיב לוֹ (addressed to God) "with thy hands contend for it" (Is. 49^{25} 51^{22} &c.), is (as Di. also allows) a plausible conjecture (Stade, *l.c.*).

The brevity of the blessing of Judah, and the martial terms of v.[11], which seem unsuited to the character of Levi, led K. Kohler (*Der Segen Jacob's*, 1867, p. 5) to conjecture that v.[7] was misplaced, and that it ought to follow v.[10], in which case v.[11] would of course relate to Judah. Grätz (*Gesch. der Juden*, ii. 1 (1875), p. 486 f.) went further, following R. Eli'ezer, a Talmudic author of the 2nd cent. A.D., in applying to this verse the

---

7. ידיו רב לו] constr. as Ps. 3^{8} $17^{13.14}$ 44^{3} &c. (G-K. § 144. 4^{a}; Dav. § 109 R.[3]).

---

* On the theocratic relation of the kingdom of Israel to that of Judah, see an excellent paper by the Rev. A. Robertson, D.D., in the *Thinker*, Jan. 1895, who points out well that though Judah *became* ultimately more important, nevertheless, during the two centuries following the division of the kingdom, Israel was both politically the more powerful and also the chief centre of spiritual life and activity (Elijah, Elisha', Amos, Hosea').

Digitized by Google

somewhat bold exegetical canon that when a word did not suit a passage another more suitable might, if necessary, be substituted for it, and, in reading accordingly, *Sime'on* (twice) for *Judah*. Heilprin, *Hist. Poetry of the Hebrews* (New York, 1879), i. 113–116, and Bacon, *Triple Tradition*, pp. 270–272, argue strongly in support of this correction, and, combining with it the emendation suggested by Kohler, obtain, as the Blessing of Sime'on (v.^{7}), "Hear, O Jehovah, the voice of Sime'on, And bring him to his people" (the reference being supposed to be to the remnant of Sime'onites, who found refuge in Se'ir, 1 Ch. 4$^{42f.}$); and, as the Blessing of Judah (v.^{11}), "Judah with his hands contends for himself, And thou art an help from his foes: Bless, O Jehovah, his might, And accept the work of his hands; Smite through in the loins those that rise up against him, And them that hate him, that they rise not again" (Heilprin, p. 116 f.; slightly differently Bacon, p. 315). The correction is an ingenious one: but no reason appears for the transposition, and other alterations, which it postulates: and it is difficult not to feel the justice of Dillmann's verdict, that it is "too violent" to be probable. (The play on *Sime'on* in "Hear" (*shĕma'*) is no appreciable argument in its favour; for though the names of the tribes are played on in Gn. 49 (v.$^{8.16.19}$), this is not elsewhere the case in Dt. 33,—ידיו in v.^{7}, on יהודה, being very doubtful.)

8–11. Levi.

8 Thy Thummim and thy Urim be for the man, thy godly one,
Whom thou didst prove at Massah,
With whom thou contendedst at the waters of Meribah:
9 Who saith of his father, and of his mother, I have not seen him,
Neither doth he acknowledge his brethren,
Nor knoweth he his own children;
For they keep thy saying, and observe thy covenant:
10 They show Jacob thy judgments,
And Israel thy direction (law);
They set incense in thy nostril,
And whole-offerings upon thine altar:
11 Bless, O Jehovah, his might,
And favour (accept) the work of his hands;
Smite through in the loins those that rise up against him,
And them that hate him, that they rise not (again).

Contrast Gn. 49$^{5-7}$.—**8.** Jehovah is addressed, with the petition that the privilege of guarding for Israel the sacred lot may be confirmed to Levi, whose fidelity had been so severely tested in the wilderness.—*Thummim and Urim*] elsewhere always *Urim and Thummim*, Ex. 28^{30} Lev. 8^{8} Ezr. 2^{63} (= Ne. 7^{65}), and esp. 1 S. 14^{41} 𝔊 ("Wherefore hast thou not answered thy servant this day? if this iniquity be in me or in Jonathan my son, O Jehovah, God of Israel, give Urim; but if it be in thy people Israel, give Thummim")†: the *Urim* alone

Digitized by Google

are named Nu. 27^{21} 1 S. 28^{6}†.—*For the man, thy godly one*] *i.e.* the tribe Levi, conceived collectively, and personified as an individual; in clauses [b, c] it is then described as being "proved" at Massah, and "contended" with at the waters of Meribah, viz. (if the reference be to what is described in our existing Pent.) in the persons of its two representative leaders, Moses and Aaron. This rend. is supported by the prominence which it gives (in agreement with the other blessings) to the tribe itself: but the sense put upon cl. [b, c] is rather strained. Dillm. Oettli render "for the men of thy godly one," viz. of Moses, the men of his tribe (איש being collective, as Jos. $9^{6f.}$ Jud. 8^{22} Is. $5^{3.7}$; and often); in this case the relatives in cl. [b, c] will refer directly to Moses. The passage, however, occasions difficulty: for (1) the words, taken in their natural sense, refer to the tribe generally (notice the *plurals* in v.[9f.]), which however is not mentioned upon either of the occasions referred to (Ex. 17^{1-7}; Nu. 20^{1-13}); and (2) even if it be granted that the tribe is conceived as represented by Moses or Aaron, nothing is elsewhere said of either having been tried by Jehovah at these places: but (with a play on the two names) it is said in J (Ex. $17^{2b.7}$: cf. Dt. 6^{16} 9^{22}) that the people "proved" (see on 6^{16}) Jehovah at Massah ("Proving"), and in E (Ex. $17^{2a.7}$) that they "contended" on the same occasion with Moses at Meribah ("Contention"); further, at a much later period of their wanderings (Nu. 20^{3a} J), that they "contended" with Moses,—or (in P) with Jehovah (Nu. 20^{13}, cf. 27^{14}),—at the "waters of Meribah," in Ḳadesh. Upon the supposition that the present passage alludes to the incidents thus recorded, it is commonly understood to say, with another play, that Jehovah "proved" the tribe in Moses' person—or (Di. Oe.) "proved" Moses himself—at Massah (Ex. 17), viz. by observing how he would behave under the provocation of the people's complaints; and "contended" with him at the waters of Meribah (Nu. 20: cf. Ps. 81^{8} "I tested thee [Israel] at the waters of Meribah"), viz. indirectly, by subjecting him to the test of a trying and arduous situation.* But this ex-

* Which, at least according to P (Nu. $20^{12.24}$ 27^{14} Dt. 32^{51}; cf. Ps. $106^{32f.}$), neither Moses nor Aaron endured. This representation certainly

Digitized by Google

planation cannot be said to be a natural one. Wellh. (*Hist.* p. 134), Bredenkamp (*Gesetz u. Proph.* p. 177, Smend, *Alttest. Rel.-gesch.* p. 78: Dillm. also inclines) render cl. [c], "*For* whom thou contendedst" (Is. 1^{27} 51^{22})—viz. by enabling Moses and Aaron to satisfy the people with water: but even so, as Bred. allows, the reference to Ex. 17 Nu. 20 remains difficult; and the possibility must be admitted that another version of the incidents at Massah and Meribah was current, in which the fidelity of the tribe was in some manner tested directly by Jehovah.—*Godly* (חסיד)] lit. *kind* or *kindly* (akin to חֶסֶד, p. 102); but as in ancient Israel kind men were also commonly God-fearing men, the word acquired the sense of *godly, pious*. It is so used often in the Psalms, esp. late ones (4^4 30^5 31^{24} 37^{28} &c.); and in the Maccabæan age it became the name of the pious, or patriotic party, who opposed the Hellenization of their countrymen (Ἀσιδαῖοι, 1 Macc. 2^{42} 7^{13} 2 Macc. 14^6).—**9.** The subject is the tribe generally, *who* referring to *man* (or *men*) in v.[8], the numbers alternating in the parallel clauses, as is often the case in Heb. poetry, when a *group* of persons is spoken of. The intention of the verse is to predicate of the members of the tribe a repudiation of all considerations based upon earthly relationship. The reference is, however, disputed. The verbs in cl. [a, b, c] may be either present or past (*said, did, knew*). It is often understood to refer to the incident Ex. 32^{27-29}, when the "sons of Levi," disregarding all ties of relationship, signally manifested their zeal for Jehovah, and were rewarded, it seems (see v.[29]; and cf. on 10^8), with the prerogative of the priesthood. Others (J. D. Mich., Graf) suppose the words to be meant more generally, and to denote hyperbolically the disregard of even the closest of worldly ties or interests, with which the discharge of a sacred office—whether the administration of justice (on 17^7), or other duties (Mal. 2^9)—should be conducted. Thus Onq. paraphrases: "Who has no compassion on his father or his mother when they are convicted by the court, and regards not the persons of his brothers and sisters." The causal clause,

cannot be alluded to here, where the context shows that something creditable to the tribe (or its representatives) is in the poet's thoughts.

Digitized by Google

the wording of which is quite general ("For they keep," &c.), favours this interpretation. Probably, however, the other should not be excluded (Baudissin, *Priesterthum*, p. 77; Oettli; cf. Dillm.). The intention of the poet is to describe the disinterested spirit in which the ideal Levite discharged his priestly office; but in doing this he so expresses himself as to allude at the same time to the occasion Ex. 32^{27-29}, on which a similar spirit was displayed in a conspicuous degree. As Oettli remarks, the words are applicable, in a certain sense, to every sacred trust: cf. Mt. 10^{37} Lk. 14^{26}; also Dt. $13^{7(8)ff.}$. For another view of the meaning of the passage, see Wellh. *Hist.* p. 135 f.—*I have not seen him*] a hyperbolical expression of repudiation (Job 8^{18}).—*Acknowledge* (הִכִּיר)] 21^{17}.—*For they keep, &c.*] the ground of this disinterestedness, viz. their strict observance of Jehovah's commands.—*Saying*] i.e. *command* (Is. 5^{24}).—*Covenant*] cf. on 4^{13}. Here of the conditions under which the priesthood was entrusted to the tribe of Levi (so Jer. 33^{21b} Mal. $2^{4.5.8}$).—**10.** Two great duties of the priestly tribe are indicated in these words: (1) to decide, in cases brought before them, in accordance with the principles of Jehovah's "direction," or "law," of which they are the guardians (Jer. 8^{8}); (2) to maintain the service of the altar. (For three other duties, see on 10^{8}.) *Show* is lit. *direct* (*hôrāh*), corresponding to the following *direction* (law): the two terms are used, which denote regularly the priestly duty (see on 17^{10}; and cf. Ez. 44^{23}) of giving *direction* (*Tôrāh*) on points of ceremonial observance. Micah (3^{11}) charges the priests with granting "direction" for money: Ez. (22^{26}) and Zeph. (3^{4}) speak of Jehovah's "direction" (law) suffering violence; for an example of "direction" being inquired for, see Hag. 2^{11-13}. By *judgments* will be meant decisions in civil and criminal causes, or the ordinances founded upon them (see Ex. 21^{1} Ez. 44^{24}; and cf. on 4^{1} 17^{7}). In neither case is, however, a *moral* element to be regarded as excluded. "Jehovah is distinguished from the gods of Israel's neighbours, and towers above them, as the God in whose name justice was administered, and of whom it could be said that He was not known where the laws of honour and

9. לאביו] ל=*about*, as Gn. 20^{13} *al.*

Digitized by Google

good faith were violated;" hence the priest, as His organ and interpreter, is "the bearer and appointed upholder of *right*" (Kuenen, *Hibb. Lect.* p. 90). And so Hosea represents Jehovah's *Tôrāh* as a *moral* agency (4^{6-8}), and attributes the crimes rampant in Israel (v.$^{1b.\,2}$) to the priests' forgetfulness of its true character (v.^{6b}), and to their worldly unconcern for the "knowledge" of God, which its possession implies (v.^{6a}); many moral precepts, also, are embodied in Lev. 18. 19 (H); and the "judgments" of Ex. 21–23 are directly designed for the maintenance of justice, and civic righteousness, between man and man in Israel (comp. Kuen. *l.c.* pp. 83–91; *Hex.* § 10. 4; Smend, *Alttest. Rel.-gesch.* pp. 77 f., 277; Wellh. *Hist.* pp. 394–396, 434–439; Montefiore, *Hibb. Lect.* pp. 45 f., 49, 64 f., 69–71; Benzinger, pp. 321, 324, 412 f.; Nowack, ii. 97 f.).—*Incense*] to burn incense was the duty (and privilege) of the priests: see 1 S. 2^{28}, and (in P) Nu. 16^{6-10} 17^{5} (16^{40}). (Wellh. *Hist.* p. 64 f., Nowack, ii. 246 f., and others, contend that here and Is. 1^{13} not *incense*, but *sweet-smoke*, is meant, and that the reference is to the fat of the thank-offerings burnt upon the altar: cf. Ps. 66^{15}, and the cognate verb הקטיר "send up in sweet-smoke," Lev. 3^{5} &c.)—*In thy nostril*] for the fig., cf. Ps. $18^{9\,(8)}$, and Gn. 8^{21} Am. 5^{21} Lev. 26^{31}.—*Whole-offerings* (כליל)] see on $13^{17\,(16)}$.—With the entire passage, comp. Mal. 2^{4-9}, where, in terms recalling those used here (*law* = "direction"), the prophet deplores Levi's declension from its ideal.—**11.** *His might*] *i.e.* his ability for the efficient discharge of his sacred trust (so 𝔊 ἰσχύς, 𝔙 *fortitudo*; Graf, Ke. Di. Stade, Oettli). In itself the word might equally mean *substance*, *possessions* (AV. RV.), as 8^{17}; but wealth is not, either elsewhere in Dt., or generally in the earlier historical books, the predominant characteristic of the tribe.—*The work of his hands*] *i.e.* (at least chiefly) his services in connexion with the altar, which, if they are to be efficacious, must be *favoured* (or *accepted*) by Jehovah: cf. Hos. 8^{13} = Jer. 14^{10} (ויהוה לא רצם), Am. 5^{22} Ez. 20^{41} 43^{27}; and *for acceptance* (לְרָצוֹן) Jer. 6^{20} Is. 56^{7} 60^{7} Lev. 1^{3} *al.* (rendered *favour* Ps. $5^{13\,(12)}$ Is. 60^{10} *al.*).—*Smite through* (מְחַץ)] or *wound severely* (32^{39}), *con-*

11. מתנים] *as to*, or *on*, the loins: cf. Ps. 3^{8}, and on 19^{6} (Dav. § 71).—

Digitized by Google

tuse: cf. of the head (irremediably), Jud. 5^{26} Ps. 68^{22} 110^{6} Hab. 3^{13}.—*The loins*] named as the centre of strength (Ps. 66^{11} 69^{24} Na. $2^{2.11}$ Ez. 29^{7}).—קָמָיו] Ex. 15^{7} Ps. $18^{40(39)}$ *al.* (poet.). Cf. Ps. $18^{39(38)}$ אמחצם ולא יכלו קום.—The general picture given in these verses, of the rights and privileges of the tribe of Levi, harmonizes with the representation contained in other passages of Dt.; see the notes on $10^{8f.}$ 18^{1-8} (pp. 214, 219 f.).

12. Benjamin.

> [12] The beloved of Jehovah dwelleth securely beside him:
> He encompasseth him all the day,
> And He dwelleth between his shoulders.

Contrast Gn. 49^{27}. The tribe is characterized (so to say) as Jehovah's darling, enjoying in a special degree His protection and regard. "Certainly the whole people is Jehovah's יְדִיד Jer. 11^{15} [cf. 12^{7}], all His faithful servants are ידידים Ps. 60^{7} [$=108^{7}$], but the tribe which He has chosen to put His name there (Dt. 12^{5} &c.; cf. Ps. 87^{2}), is specially honoured by Him, and receives this title in a special sense (cf. Ps. 127^{2}), as Solomon was once named *Jedid*iah 2 S. 12^{25}" (Graf). Perhaps the smallness of the tribe, and the recollection of the affection with which, as tradition told, its ancestor, the child of Jacob's old age, had been regarded by his father (Gn. 43^{1-14} 44^{20} &c.), may have contributed towards its being so described. ידיד is a poetical word, choicer than אהוב, and occurring, besides the passages quoted, only Is. 5^{1} Ps. $45^{1\,(title)}$ 84^{2}.—*Dwelleth securely*] lit. *in confidence*: a frequent phrase, denoting undisturbed security, Jer. 23^{6} 33^{16} Ps. 16^{9} (of freedom from the fear of death); cf. with ישב, v.[28] 12^{10} Lev. $25^{18.19}$ &c.—*Beside him* (עליו)] the word is doubtful (see below); it introduces an idea which harmonizes imperfectly with the figures in cl. [b, c]; and the thought of cl. [a] is complete without it (for the

קמיו] poet., as often, for הקמים עליו (Dav. § 98 R.[1]).—מן יקומון] *i.e.* מֵאֲשֶׁר יקומון poet. for מִקּוּם (Is. 24^{10} &c.): Dr. § 41.—**12.** Sam. 𝔊𝔖 omit the first עליו (𝔊 ὁ θεὸς might be thought to be a paraphrase of עליון; but this is elsewhere regularly ὕψιστος); 𝔙 and several Heb. MSS. omit the 2nd. In view of the wide use of על to denote *beside* (*Lex.* על 6), it cannot perhaps be said that שכן על would not be a possible constr.; still על=*beside* is rarely said of *persons* except with עמד and נצב (Gn. 18^{2} 45^{1} &c.), which are not quite parallel (being prop. to stand *over*), and never elsewhere with שכן or ישב. The first clause is, in fact, complete at *securely*: in cl. [b] it seems that עליו

Digitized by Google

ground of Benjamin's security follows in cl. [b, c]). It has not improbably come into the text here by error.—*He encompasseth him*] God encircles Benjamin with His protection (cf. Is. 31^5). —*And He dwelleth between his shoulders*] alluding to the site of the Temple, just within the rocky border of Benjamin (Onq. וּבְאַרְעֵיהּ תִּשְׁרֵי שְׁכִנְתָּא, Rashi, Ew. Graf, Dillm. &c.). The boundary between Benjamin and Judah ran close along the S.E. of Jerusalem (cf. Jos. 15^8 18^{16}); according to the later Jews, the Temple itself was in Benjamin, and the courts in Judah. Benjamin is pictured as a reclining man; the use of the term *shoulders* (כתפיו) being facilitated by the fact that it has also a geographical sense, denoting the *shoulder* or *side* of a mountain (*e.g.* Jos. 15^8 18^{16} the "shoulder of the Jebusite," of the same mountain-side on the top of which the Temple stood). שכן is the usual expression for Jehovah's *dwelling* among His people, as Is. 8^{18} Joel $4^{17.21}$ Ps. $68^{17(16)}$ 74^2 Ez. 43^7 *al.*; cf. (in the causative conj.) Dt. 12^{11}, with the note. The expl. "Between his (Jehovah's) shoulders—*i.e.* on His back—he (Benjamin) dwells" (Schultz, Volck, Ke.), introduces an unsuitable idea, as well as one which is incongruous with the preceding clause; Jehovah may be said finely to *bear* His people (32^{11} Ex. 19^4 Is. 46^4), but Benjamin could hardly be described as *dwelling* upon Him.

13–17. Joseph.—Fertility of soil, and indomitable military strength, are the blessings for which the poet eulogizes the double tribe of Ephraim and Manasseh. The verses contain several unmistakable reminiscences of the Blessing on Joseph in Gn. 49^{22-26}.

> 13 Blessed of Jehovah be his land,
> From the choice fruits of heaven, from the dew [*conj.*: of heaven above],
> And from the deep that coucheth beneath:

חפף and עליו חפף are alternative readings, and one of the two עליו should be omitted.—חפף] only here. The meaning *surround* (rather than *cover*) is supported by Arab. *ḥaffa* (Qor. 18^{31} of a garden *surrounded* by palm-trees, 39^{75} of angels *surrounding* God's throne), חוֹף *shore* (as *surrounding* the sea), חֻפָּה *bridal chamber* Ps. 19^6 Joel 2^{16} (as *enclosed*). Is. 4^5 חֻפָּה seems to mean *canopy*; but the text is here doubtful. Aq. παστώσει (whence 𝔙 quasi *in thalamo* morabitur), treating חפף as a denom. from חֻפָּה.

Digitized by Google

14 And from the choice fruits of the crops of the sun,
And from the choice fruits of the yield of the months;
15 And from the top of the ancient mountains,
And from the choice fruits of the everlasting hills;
16 And from the choice fruits of the earth and its fulness,
And the favour of him that dwelt in the bush—
Let them come upon the head of Joseph,
And upon the crown of the head of him that is prince among his brethren!
17 His firstling bullock,—it hath majesty,
And its horns are horns of a wild-ox;
With them he pusheth peoples,
All together the ends of the earth:
Those are the myriads of Ephraim,
And those are the thousands of Manasseh.

13. The poet begins with the primary requisites of a productive soil, an abundant supply of rain and dew from the sky, and of fertilizing springs in the earth. *From* (v.$^{13-16}$) denotes the source of the blessing: English idiom would naturally say *with*; but as this could not stand in v.$^{13c. 15a}$, *from* has been adopted throughout for the sake of uniformity. מֶגֶד by usage (see below) denotes "choice *fruits*"; rain and

13. מגר] v.$^{14-16}$ Ct. $4^{13.16}$ 7^{14} (each time of fruits)†. Arab. *majad* is *honour*, *dignity*, *nobility*; Syr. מגרא (rare) is *fruit*, 𝕿 מגרא (also rare) is *choice fruit*. The word may be a North Isr. Aramaism.—**16.** שׁכני] the ׳ is an old case-ending, having in Arab. the force of a gen. (as *'ibnu 'lmalki*, son of the king), but in Heb. retained only exceptionally as a binding vowel, connecting a word in the *st. c.* with its gen.: viz. in certain pr. names (as מלכיצדק, גבריאל, חניאל &c.), in the particles בלתי (regularly), and זולתי (Dt. 1^{36} 4^{12} Jos. 11^{13} 1 K. 3^{18} 12^{20} Ps. 18^{32}†), otherwise in prose only Gn. $31^{39.39}$, and (doubtfully) Lev. $26^{42.42.42}$: in poetry, in מִנִּי (for מִן), some 30 times (not in the Pent.), otherwise about 30 times, esp. in participles before a noun provided with a prep. (G-K. § 130. 1; Dav. § 28 R.^{1}), viz. in the Pent. Gn. $49^{11.11}$ Ex. 15^{6} נאדרי בכח, and here; in other books, Hos. 10^{11} אהבתי לדוש, Is. 1^{21} מלאתי משפט, $22^{16.16}$ Jer. 10^{17} ישבתי במצור, 22^{23} ישבתי בלבנון מקננתי בארזים, $49^{16.16}$ 51^{13} Ez. 27^{3} Ob.^{3} Mic. 7^{14} Zech. $11^{17.17}$ Lam. $1^{1.1.1}$ 4^{21} Ps. 101^{5} 110^{4} $113^{5.6.7.9}$ 114^{8} 123^{1}, prob. in אני ואפסי עוד Is. $47^{8.10}$ Zeph. 2^{15}, very doubtfully in Ps. 113^{8} (read להושׁיבו), 116^{1}: where the word is a ptcp. fem., the Massorites often substitute a more regular form, as Jer. 10^{17}. See further G-K. § 90. 3^{a}. The facts of the usage have but to be stated for it to become at once apparent that it is no "archaism," upon which an argument can be founded for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch (cf. *L.O.T.*^{5} p. 528 f.).—סנה] Ex. 3^{2-4}†.—תָּבוֹאתָה] an impossible form: read either (Dillm.) תָּבוֹאנָה (1 S. 10^{7}), cf. תהיין Gn. 49^{26}; or (Röd. in *Thes.* Index, p. 11, Ols. p. 452, König, i. 646 f., G-K. § 48. 3 R.) תָּבוֹאָה, the cohort. with the 3rd pers., as Is. 5^{19} (Dr. § 45 *n.*).

Digitized by Google

dew are poetically pictured as the fruit of heaven. As the text stands, *dew* is explanatory of "choice fruits of heaven"; rain seems thus to be excluded: it is probable that, by a very slight change, we should read *above* for *from the dew* (מעל for מטל), improving at the same time the parallelism of the verse. *Heaven above*, exactly as Gn. 27^{39}, and esp. 49^{25}, the same verse from which the following words, "the deep that coucheth beneath," are also borrowed. The "deep," like the "deeps" of 8^{7} (see note), is used of the subterranean waters (4^{18}), the supposed source of springs and rivers, as of nutriment to trees (Ez. 31^{4}).—*Coucheth* (רֹבֶצֶת)] properly, as an animal (on $29^{19(20)}$): perhaps the subterranean deep was pictured as a gigantic monster.—**14.** The allusion is to the various crops of fruit, vegetables, grain, &c., which ripen at different seasons of the year.—*Crops* (תְּבוּאֹת)] lit. *in-comes* (cf. הֵבִיא *bring in*, 2 S. 9^{10}): in the sing. usu. rendered *increase* ($14^{22.\,28}$), in the pl. used of the *crops* of successive years (2 K. 8^{6} Lev. $25^{15.\,16}$). —*Yield* (גֶּרֶשׁ)] properly something *thrust forth*: only here.—*Months* (יְרָחִים)] with a play upon יֶרַח *moon*, in poetical parallelism with *sun*.—**15.** Cf. Gn. 49^{26} ("the blessings of the perpetual mountains [read הַרְרֵי for הוֹרַי; see Hab. 3^{6}], the delectable things of the everlasting hills"). May the mountain sides, to their very top (Ps. 72^{16}), be fertile with good things, for the support of man or beast!—**16.** The first part of the blessing here reaches its climax: may Nature at large be prodigal for Joseph of her best gifts! may he secure, above all, Jehovah's favourable eye! *The earth and its fulness*, as Ps. 24^{1} Mic. 1^{2} *al.*; cf. Ps. 50^{12} 89^{12} (תֵּבֵל).—*Favour* (רצון)] cognate with רָצָה *to favour* (or *accept*), v.[11]: cf. Ps. $5^{13(12)}$ $30^{8(7)}$ $51^{20(18)}$ (AV. *good pleasure*), $89^{18(17)}$. AV. here *goodwill*. It corresponds to εὐδοκία. "In 'Him that dwelt in the bush' (Ex. $3^{2\text{-}4}$), God, by an advance beyond Gn. $49^{24\text{f.}}$, is designated emblematically as the God of the Mosaic covenant" (Dillm.). To *dwell*, or *inhabit* (שכן),—the word used regularly of Jehovah's *abiding* with His people (v.[12]),—suggests a more permanent occupancy than is implied in the narrative Ex. $3^{2\text{-}4}$; and is possibly the survival of an ancient belief to that effect (cf. W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.* p. 176 f., ed. 2, p. 193 f.). Clauses [c-d]

Digitized by Google

are exactly as Gn. 49^{26}, with the one change of *let them come* for *let them be*.—נְזִיר אֶחָיו] so Gn. 49^{26}. Lit. either "the *separate* one (הִזִּיר)," or "the *crowned* one (נֵזֶר) of his brethren," *i.e.* either *distinguished* from the others, in influence, wealth, &c., or actually a *prince* among them: cf. Lam. 4^{7} (RV. *nobles*)†; מִנְּזָרַיִךְ Nah. 3^{17} (RV. *thy crowned*)†. In either case, a title of distinction, implying superiority to the other tribes, and reflecting the affluence, dignity, and power which, in its flourishing days, belonged in a pre-eminent degree to the double tribe of Joseph.—**17.** The poet proceeds here to describe, in hyperbolical language, the invincible military power possessed by Joseph's firstborn; and ends by stating explicitly that the people thus blessed are the thronging multitudes of Ephraim and Manasseh.—*His firstling bullock*] *i.e.* Ephraim, in accordance with Gn. 48^{13-20}. Ephraim is figured as a young and nobly-built bullock, possessing horns of immense size and strength, with which it pushes, or butts (1 K. 22^{11} Dan. 8^{4}), with such effect that even remotest nations are powerless before it.—*Wild ox*] Heb. *rĕ'ēm*, a gigantic species of ox, now extinct, the formidable horns of which are also alluded to in Ps. 22^{22} 92^{11} Nu. 23^{22} (= 24^{8}).

The characteristics of the *rĕ'ēm* are, in particular, its formidable horns, its size and strength, and its untamableness (see esp. Job 39^{9-12}). Tristram (*NHB.* pp. 146–150) pointed out that the animal meant must be one now extinct, the *Auerochs* of the old Germans, the *Urus* of Cæsar (*B.G.* vi. 28,—described as being nearly as large as an elephant and untamable), the *Bos primigenius* of naturalists; Mr. Houghton has shown more recently, from the pictorial representations on the Assyrian sculptures, that the Assyrian *rîmu* was a gigantic species of *Bos*; and it is remarkable that four teeth of an ox similar to the *Bos primigenius* should have been discovered (Tristram, *l.c.* p. 150; *Land of Israel*, pp. 9–12) in the valley of the Nahr-el-Kalb, in the same neighbourhood in which Tiglath-Pileser I. (B.C. 1120–1100) claims to have hunted and killed the *rîmu*, "opposite the land of the Ḥittites, and at the foot of Lebanon" (Houghton, *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* v. (1877), pp. 33, 326 ff.; *Nat. Hist. of the Ancients*, p. 171 ff.: see also Cheyne on Is. 34^{7}; Friedrich Delitzsch, *The Heb. Lang. in the Light of Ass. Research*, 1883, p. 6 f., *Proleg. eines neuen Heb.-Aram. Wörterbuches*, p. 16 f.). Comp. Schrader, *KAT.*[2] p. 456, where Shalmaneṣer II. says, "His land I trod down like a *rîmu*."—The Arab. *ri'm* is the *Antilope leucoryx*, a graceful, gentle creature, inhabiting the sandy wastes of Arabia and N.E. Africa, which cannot be the Heb. *rĕ'ēm*.

---

17. בכור שורו] the *cas. pendens*, as 32^{4}.—יחדו] cf. on v.[5].

Ends of the earth] parallel to *peoples*, as to *nations* in Ps. 2^{8} $22^{28\,(27)}$ Is. 52^{10}.—*Those* (הם)] *i.e.* such as have been described: so Knob. Ke. Volck, Stade, Dillm. Oettli, Marti; cf. הוא Job 8^{19} 13^{16} 15^{9} 31^{28}. *And*, at the beginning of clause°, is best omitted with Sam. 𝔊𝔖𝔙. AV., RV., *al.* (in both clauses) *And they*, in which case the two horns will be referred to, and explained as signifying Ephraim and Manasseh respectively. With this verse contrast Gn. $49^{23f.}$, where Joseph, though victorious through the aid of its God, is described as having severely suffered in contests with its foes.

18–19. Zebulun and Issachar.

18 Rejoice, Zebulun, in thy going out,
And, Issachar, in thy tents:
19 They call peoples to (the) mountain,
There they offer sacrifices of righteousness:
For they suck the abundance of the seas,
And the hidden treasures of the sand.

18. A poetical variation of the common phrase, "going out" and "coming in" (Ps. 121^{8}; see on 28^{6}), used to designate a man's whole activity and enterprise. Zebulun, though, to judge from Jos. $19^{10\text{-}16}$, its territory, at least in the main, was inland (Asher extending along the sea-coast), is spoken of in Gn. 49^{13} as reaching to the sea ("about Carmel," Jos. *Ant.* v. 1. 22); and Issachar, in Gn. $49^{14f.}$, as devoting itself only too readily to the easy task of cultivating its fertile soil: here, accordingly, it is Zebulun who is to *rejoice* in its "going out," *i.e.* in the enterprises which an approach to the sea would open to it, and Issachar in its "tents," *i.e.* in the more sedentary pursuits of an agricultural community: each, in other words, is to be attended with success in its own principal, or most characteristic, occupation. There is no trace here of the disparagement with which Issachar is regarded in Gn. $49^{14f.}$. At the same time, the two ideas are not each to be limited rigidly to the clause in which it stands; the distribution is poetical rather than logical; cf. Pr. 10^{1} Is. 11^{12} (where in the Heb. *outcasts* is masc., and *dispersed* fem.).—**19.** It seems that these two Northern tribes, whose position gave them facilities for commercial intercourse with foreigners (cf. Gn. 49^{13} "And he (Zebulun) is for a haven of ships; and his

Digitized by Google

furthest point reacheth unto Ṣidon"), were in the habit of holding sacrificial feasts, in which foreign nations were invited to take part. *Call*, i.e. *invite* to a feast, as 1 S. $9^{13.\,24}$ 1 K. $1^{9.\,41}$. What "mountain" is meant is quite indeterminate: at the time when the Blessing was written, local altars and sacrifices would be customary (p. 137); hence Herder and Graf thought of Tabor, Knob. of Carmel (cf. 1 K. 18^{30b}): Ẓion (𝕿 Rashi [both, however, understanding by *peoples* the tribes of Israel: cf. on v.^{3}], Ew., Bredenkamp, p. 140) seems too distant to be alluded to here; the high land (3^{25}) of Canaan generally (Schultz, Keil) is too wide an area to be probable, especially where two particular tribes are concerned. There may have been more than one mountain sanctuary in Zebulun and Issachar; and the reference may be to these generally. The indefiniteness of the expression, coupled with our ignorance of the customs of the time, prevents our interpreting the passage with entire certainty. Graf (p. 56) and Stade (*Gesch.* i. 171) may be right in conjecturing that sacrificial feasts were held periodically in the territory of these two tribes, which were frequented by the people of the surrounding districts, and utilized by them, in the manner of a fair, for purposes of trade; Stade compares the Mina festival of Mecca (Sprenger, *Geogr. Arab.* p. 222 ff.).—*Sacrifices of righteousness*] *i.e.* sacrifices offered in a right frame of mind, the outcome of a right spirit (Ps. $4^{6\,(5)}$ $51^{21\,(19)}$†).—*For*] the reason why the two tribes invite foreign nations to such feasts: the wealth derived by them from the sea enables them to do so.—*Suck*] fig. for drawing rich nutriment and sustenance (Is. 60^{16} $66^{11.\,12}$).—*The abundance of the seas, &c.*] the allusion appears to be to the wealth accruing to the two tribes from the sea, partly through fisheries or maritime commerce (cf. Gn. 49^{13}), partly by the manufacture

19. שפע] only here: שִׁפְעָה Job 22^{11} 38^{34} (of waters); 2 K. 9^{17} Is. 60^{6} Ez. 26^{10} (a *troop* of men or animals)†. The root in Aram. is to *stream over, overflow*: see 𝕿 Pr. 3^{10} 5^{16}, 𝕾 Rom. 5^{5} (for ἐκκέχυται); cf. Is. 48^{18} 𝕿 כְּשִׁפְעַ נְהַר פְּרָת.—שׂפני טמוני חול] cf. Job 20^{17} נהרי נחלי דבש; and see on 21^{11} (Dav. § 28 R.^{6}). שׂפן (only here) is merely another orthogr. of כפן v.^{21}, which is generally used fig. of *covering in* walls with panelling (Jer. 22^{14}). טמן is *to hide*, esp. in the earth (Jos. 7^{21}); cf. מטמנים *buried stores* Jer. 41^{8}, מטמוני מסתרים Is. 45^{3}.

of glass from the sand about ʿAkko. Ps.-Jonathan paraphrases: "For they will settle on the shore of the Great Sea, and delight themselves with tritons, and catch mussels, and dye purple with their blood the cords (Nu. 15^{38}) of their mantles, and from the sand they will produce mirrors (*specularia*) and vessels of glass; for the treasures of the deep are revealed to them." Josephus (*BJ.* ii. 10. 2) states that the sand of the Belæus, which runs into the sea a little S. of ʿAkko, was much used in the manufacture of glass (cf. Plin. *H.N.* v. 17, xxxvi. 65; Tac. *Hist.* v. 7); and Strabo (xvi. 2. 25) says the same of the sand on the coast between ʿAkko and Tyre.

20–21. Gad.

> 20 Blessed be he that enlargeth Gad:
> He dwelleth like a lioness,
> And teareth the arm, yea, the crown of the head.
> 21 And he looked out a first part for himself,
> For there a commander's portion was reserved:
> And he came to [*conj.* with] the heads of the people
> He executed the righteousness of Jehovah,
> And his ordinances with Israel.

20. Gad's "enlarger" is God, who frees him from the foes who hem in, and broadens his territory (Gn. 26^{22}; cf. with גְּבוּל *border* Am. 1^{13} Ex. 34^{24} Dt. 12^{20} 19^{8}). In cl. [b, c] the warlike character of the tribe is signalized (cf. Gn. 49^{19}; 1 Ch. 12^{8} Gadite warriors, whose "faces were like the faces of lions, and as swift as roes upon the mountains"): it lies on its broad and picturesque table-land (*S. & P.* p. 320), like some huge lion, ready to tear in pieces, not only the arm, but also the head, of any one who presumes to assail it. Gad was the strongest tribe on the E. of Jordan (Nu. 32^{34-36} Jos. 13^{24-28}); and it maintained its position and importance there long after Reuben had become insignificant, though it proved unable to cope with Tiglath-Pileṣer (1 Ch. 5^{26}).—*Dwelleth* (שכן)] cf. Nu. 24^{2} Jud. 5^{17} Gn. 49^{13}. The comparison to a lioness, as Nu. 23^{24}; 24^{9b} (= Gn. 49^{9d}).—**21.** Gad, the first of the tribes to find

20. זרוע אף קדקד] אַף in poetry introduces a climax, or sometimes a synonym, with force: cf. 1 S. 2^{7} משפיל אף מרומם, Ps. 65^{14} יתרועעו אף ישירו, 74^{16} Is. 42^{13} יריע אף יצריח, 46^{6}; and on 2^{11}.

Digitized by Google

a settled home, was not unmindful afterwards of its duty towards the rest of Israel. The allusion appears to be to what is narrated in Nu. 32, according to which Gad, on condition of assisting afterwards in the conquest of Canaan, secured an allotment in the rich pasture-country, E. of Jordan. —*A first part* (ראשית)] *i.e.* a district that was both a *best* part (1 S. 15[21]), and also, as it were, the *firstfruits* (Dt. 18[4] *al.*) of the newly conquered territory.—*For there, &c.*] in the place where Gad made his choice, *a commander's portion*, *i.e.* a district worthy of a martial leader, was reserved.—*Portion* (חֶלְקָה)] viz. of land, as 2 K. 9[21. 26] (of Naboth's estate), Jos. 24[32] *al.*—*Commander* (מְחוֹקֵק)] חָקַק is to *cut in*, *engrave* (hence חֹק *statute*, 5[1], lit. something *inscribed* or *engraven* on a public tablet), fig. to *decree*, *enact*, Is. 10[1] Pr. 8[15]: מְחוֹקֵק is thus properly a *prescriber* of laws; in a primitive warlike community, however, the prescriber of laws would also be the sovereign military authority; hence מחוקק comes to mean *commander*, Jud. 5[14] (where the context points manifestly to persons holding some military office: cf. the חוקקי ישראל of v.[9]), Is. 33[22] (*our commander*, of Jehovah); also of a *commander's staff*, or *wand of office*, Gn. 49[10] Nu. 21[18] Ps. 60[9] (= 108[9]). Here the term is applied, κατ' ἐξοχήν, to the warlike tribe of Gad, which is said to have obtained, in the allotment of the conquered territory, a portion worthy of its martial character. 𝔗 (paraphrastically), 𝔖𝔙, and some moderns, "For there was the portion of the hidden (*i.e.* buried) lawgiver," *viz.* Moses; but Nebo, like Pisgah, was in the territory of Reuben (Nu. 32[38]; Jos. 13[20]), not Gad; *portion* would hardly be used of a burial-place; and the *For* is then inexplicable.—*And he came, &c.*] he took his part afterwards with the other tribes, and executed with them Jehovah's behests, in the conquest of Canaan.—*Heads of the people*] v.[5] Nu. 25[4] (JE).—*With*] an emendation. The text can hardly be made to yield a tolerable sense; see below. —*Jehovah's righteousness*] *i.e.* what is righteous in Jehovah's

21. וירא . . . לו] *saw for himself=provided* (cf. Gn. 22[8] 1 S. 16[1]).—כפון] *covered in* (on v.[19]), fig. for *laid up*, *reserved*,—unless, indeed, צפון (cf. Pr. 13[22] Job 21[19] *al.*) should be read. The masc., by attraction to מחוקק (Dav. § 116 R.[2]; G-K. § 146. 1).—וַיֵּתֵא] for וַיֶּאֱתֶה (cf. Pr. 1[10] תֹּבֵא for תֹּאבֶה): G-K. §§ 68. 2 R.; 75 R.[22]; 76. 2c. ויתא (ben Naft.) is better than ויתא (edd.);

eye, and what, if man fulfils it, becomes righteousness for him also (cf. 6^{24}).—*Ordinances*] 4^{1}. Here, it seems, of the command to make no truce with the Canaanites (Ex. 23^{31-33}).

22. Dan.

> **Dan is a lion's whelp,**
> **That leapeth forth from Bashan.**

In Gn. 49^{17} Dan is compared to a venomous serpent, darting out insidiously from its concealment, and causing a passing horse to throw its rider; and here the suddenness with which the Danite would attack and overcome his foes suggests the comparison with a lion, springing forth unexpectedly from its lair. *Lion's whelp*, as Gn. 49^{9} (of Judah). The original settlement of the Danites was in the two vales of Ajjalon and Soreḳ, in the S.W. of Ephraim (G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geogr. of the Holy Land*, p. 220 f.; cf. Jos. 19^{40-46} P; Jud. $1^{34f.}$ JE); but they found their position here untenable; and a body of them migrated to the North, and seized Leshem or Laish, at the foot of Ḥermon (Jos. 19^{47}; Jud. 18: cf. on 34^{1}), with which, after the time of Samson (Jud. 13–16), the name of the tribe is all but exclusively associated. The character given to the tribe here and Gn. 49^{17} is no doubt true to history; but our materials do not enable us to illustrate it, except from the narrative in Jud. 18 of the surprise of Laish, and perhaps from the exploits of Samson. The words *That leapeth forth from Bashan* characterize the lion, not Dan: nevertheless the locality mentioned seems to show that the poet has the Northern Dan in his mind, for Bashan appears to have extended as far as Ḥermon (cf. on 3^{1}), "laish," also, it may be noted, is one of the Heb. words for *lion* (Is. 30^{6} *al.*). Possibly

see Kön. i. 577.—ויתא ראשי עם] *came to* is a doubtful rend.; for אתה and בוא are not construed with an accus. of the pers., except in the sense of *come upon* (Ps. 119^{41}) or *against* (Job 15^{21}); and even so only with a suff. (*ll.cc.*), except Is. 41^{25} (where יבוא should very prob. be יבוס). Graf, Knob. Stade render "came *as* the heads of the people" (cf. Job 29^{25} ואשב ראש), *i.e.* fought at their head in the conquest of Canaan (3^{18} Jos. 1^{14} 4^{12} Nu. 32^{17} &c.); but the pl. is difficult in this case, and not justified by 1 Ch. 12^{18b}. Hence Dillm. Oettli read וַיֵּאת אֶת־ (Is. 41^{25}), *and he came with*.—**22.** זנק] only here: 𝕲 ἐκπηδᾷν. Syr. זנק is *jecit, sagittavit*; NH. זנק is to *squirt* or *spout out*.—הבשן] on 3^{1}.

Digitized by Google

there may be some allusion to attacks made by the Danites of Laish upon neighbouring border-tribes (cf. Stade, *Gesch.* i. 168). Lions in Bashan are not elsewhere alluded to; but its mountain ranges, and oak forests (3[1]), would form a natural ambush for them (for lions in Ḥermon, see Ct. 4[8]).

23. Naphtali.

> 23 O Naphtali, satisfied with favour,
> And full with the blessing of Jehovah:
> Possess thou the lake and the south.

Naphtali, blessed as it is with nature's gifts through Jehovah's *favour* (v.[16]), is not to be limited to the highland plateau (the "hill country of Naphtali," Jos. 20[7]) of Upper Galilee, well watered and richly wooded as it is: it is to possess in addition the yet more fertile and beautiful region, exuberant with an almost tropical vegetation, which borders on the Lake of Gennesareth. The territory of Naphtali (Jos. 19[32-39]) extended from the far North, close under Lebanon, along the W. side of Jordan, to a point a little S. of the Lake of Gennesareth. Ancient and modern writers vie with one another in praising the soil and climate of the territory owned by Naphtali: it was abundantly irrigated; and its productions were rich and varied. Lower Galilee was, however, yet more fertile and beautiful than Upper Galilee; and in the neighbourhood of the Lake, a "torrid basin," 680 ft. below the level of the Mediterranean Sea, the vegetation is semi-tropical: the plain of Gennēsar, on the N.W. of the Lake, is eulogized by Josephus (*BJ.* iii. 10. 8), on account of its climate and vegetation, almost as if it were a terrestrial paradise. See Jos. *BJ.* iii. 3. 2, Rob. *BR.* ii. 388, 402, *S. & P.* p. 374, *DB.*[2] *s.v.* GALILEE (p. 1118) and GENNESARETH, Neubauer, *Géogr. du Talmud*, pp. 45 f., 180, G. A. Smith, *Geogr. of the Holy Land*, pp. 417–420, 439 f., 446 f. The *lake* (יָם) or *sea* (cf. Is. 8[23] [9[1]]) is the "Sea of Kinnéreth" (p. 58), *i.e.* the Lake of Gennesareth (so already Onq.). By *the south* are

23. ים] Onq. (uniting the two senses of ים) מערב ים גניסר "the west of the sea of Gennēsar."—דרום] Job 37[17] Eccl. 1[6] 11[3] Ez. 21[2], and 12 times in Ez. 40–42†.—יְרָשָׁה] the emph. form of the imper. in pause, like שְׁמָעָה, סלחה Dan. 9[19] (G-K. § 48. 5). Elsewhere רֵשׁ (in pause, רָשׁ).

meant the parts bordering on this Lake,—so styled (it seems) partly in contrast to the main possessions of the tribe (which were further North), partly with allusion to the sunny warmth which prevails there.—*Satisfied*] or *filled abundantly*, *satiated*. The word, which (either as adj. or verb) is a common one (see 6^{11} $8^{10.\,12}$ 11^{15} 14^{29} 26^{12} 31^{20}), is not always quite adequately represented by *satisfied*.—*Favour*] or *good-will* (v.[16]): cf. Ps. 145^{16} משביע לכל חי רצון "satisfying all that liveth with *good-will*."

24–25. Asher.

24 Blessed above sons be Asher:
Let him be the acceptable (favoured) one of his brethren;
And (let him be) dipping his foot in oil:
25 Thy bolts be iron and bronze;
And as thy days, so let thy [strength] be.

24. Let Asher be blessed above other fathers' sons,—a child of fortune (probably with allusion to the idea which the name would suggest, *happy*; see Gn. 30^{13}); let him be his brothers' favourite, the one in whose companionship and good fortune they delight (cf. Est. 10^{3} רָצוּי לְרוֹב אֶחָיו); the last clause alludes hyperbolically (cf. Job 29^{6}) to the fertility of Asher's territory. Asher (Jos. 19^{24-31}) bordered Naphtali on the West: its climate and soil were similar to those of the higher parts of Naphtali, and were favourable in particular to the growth of the olive-tree: Josephus (*BJ*. ii. 21. 2) speaks of Galilee as οὔσης ἐλαιοφόρου μάλιστα; "it is easier," says a proverb in the Talmud, "to raise a legion of olives [read של for משל] in Galilee than to bring up a child in Palestine" (*Bereshith Rabbah*, c. 20; Neubauer, *l.c.* p. 180). The productiveness of Asher's soil gives also its point to the blessing in Gn. 49^{20} ("Asher, his bread is fat; and he yieldeth a king's dainties"). —*Blessed above sons*] cf. (for the form of expression) Jud. 5^{24} 1 S. 15^{33} ("among," Heb. *above* or *more than*, as here); also Gn. 3^{14} ("cursed *above*").—**25.** The allusion in cl. [a] may be to Asher's position: situated in the far North of Canaan, in the neighbourhood of foreigners, it would need to be well defended against encroachment and invasion. מִנְעָל (*bolt*), from נָעַל *to bolt* a door (Jud. $3^{23.\,24}$); no doubt the same as מַנְעוּל Ct. 5^{5} *al.*,

Digitized by Google

which Neh. $3^{3.6}$ shows to be distinct from בריח *bar* (3^5). In cl. [b], the word rendered *strength* is extremely uncertain; see below. The tribe is pictured as an individual; and if that be the true rend., it will be a wish that Asher's strength may be maintained as time wears on, instead of being (as it were) diminished by old age.

26–29. Conclusion, celebrating the good fortune of Israel, which has been planted by its God in a fruitful land, blessed with success against its foes, and secured in happiness and peace.

26 There is none like the God of Jeshurun:
Who rideth through the heavens as thy help,
And in his dignity through the skies.
27 The God of old is a dwelling-place;
And underneath are everlasting arms:
And he drave out the enemy from before thee;
And said, Destroy.
28 So Israel dwelt securely,
The fountain of Jacob alone,
Upon a land of corn and wine:
Yea, his heavens drop down dew!
29 Happy art thou, O Israel, who is like unto thee?
A people saved by Jehovah,
The shield of thy help, and the sword of thy dignity:
So shall thy enemies come cringing to thee,
And thou shalt tread upon their high-places.

26. The Mass. text can only be rendered *like God, O Jeshurun*: but the point is not the uniqueness of God, as such (1 S. 2^2 1 K. 8^{23}), but the uniqueness of the God of Israel; and this sense is expressed by a slight change in the punctuation (כְּאֵל for כָּאֵל); so 𝔊𝔙𝔖𝔒 Graf, Di. Oettli, &c.; cf. Ps. 68^{36} (אל ישראל), 144^{15} 146^5.—*Jeshurun*] v.[5].—*Who rideth, &c.*] Ps. $68^{34f.}$ ($^{33f.}$) is a paraphrase and commentary: Jehovah comes,

25. רבאך] "as yet unexplained" (Di.). *Strength* (𝔊𝔖𝔒 Saad.) yields an excellent sense; but it has no philological justification, a root רבא not being known. Ges. Graf, Schultz, Kn. Ke. *al.* render *rest*; but this rend. is very uncertain, depending only on a remark in the Ḳâmûs that Arab. *daba'a* has this meaning. Sam. has רביך, and Sam. Targ. (Petermann) סניך,—pointing apparently to a reading רבאך=דָּבְךָ (which Di. thinks underlies also the rend. *strength*); but this cannot have been the original text. —**26.** בעורך] *as* thy help, the ב *essentiæ* (on 10^{22}): so Ex. 18^4 Nah. 3^9 Ps. 35^2 146^5.

Digitized by Google

riding through the heavens, to give victory to His people: cf. Ps. $18^{11\,(10)\,ff.}$ Is. 19^{1} Hab. $3^{8b.\,13}$.—*Dignity* (גַּאֲוָה)] not *majesty* (גָּאוֹן); for גַּאֲוָה is used generally in a bad sense, *pride*: as here, of God, Ps. $68^{35\,(34)}$. AV. RV., *excellency*, a vague word, which (like *excellent*, Is. 4^{2} for גאון) has quite lost the idea of loftiness, or surpassing grandeur, attaching properly to the Lat. *excello*, as to the Heb. גָּאָה.—**27.** *Of old* (קֶדֶם)] lit. *aforetime*, denoting what is ancient rather than what is eternal; the word is often used, for instance, of the Mosaic age, or other distant periods of Israel's past (Ps. $44^{2\,(1)}$ $74^{2.\,12}$ Is. 51^{9} Mic. 7^{20}), and even of a former period of a single lifetime (Job 29^{2}); of mountains, v.^{15}, the heavens, Ps. $68^{34\,(33)}$; of God, as here, Hab. 1^{12} Ps. $55^{20\,(19)}$ (RV. "of old").—*Dwelling-place* (מְעֹנָה)] fem. of מָעוֹן, Ps. 90^{1} (cf. 91^{9}).—*And underneath, &c.*] not only is God a *dwelling-place* (Ps. 90^{1}) for His people, He is also their unfailing support; His almighty arms are ever beneath them, bearing them up, and sustaining them, alike in their prosperity and in their need. For the fig., cf. Hos. 11^{3} Is. 33^{2} 51^{5} Ps. 44^{4} 89^{22}.—*Thrust* (or *drave*) *out*] the word used in Ex. 23^{28-31} 33^{2} 34^{11} (JE), Jos. $24^{12.\,18}$ Jud. 2^{3} 6^{9} (גֵּרֵשׁ). Not elsewhere in Dt., where the same idea is generally expressed by הוֹרִישׁ *dispossess* (see on 4^{38} 9^{5}),—in AV. RV. rendered likewise, unfortunately, *drive out*. The tenses in this and the next verse show that when these words were written the Israelites must have been long settled in Canaan.—*And said, Destroy*] thereby authorizing Israel to take possession of Canaan (cf. Ex. $23^{27\,ff.}$ Dt. $7^{2.\,24}$ &c.).—*Destroy*] 1^{27} (phil. n.).—**28.** The consequences of Jehovah's protection: Israel's security in a hom[e] blessed by nature's bounty.—*The fountain of Jacob*] *i.e.* th[e] constant succession of his descendants, figured as a strea[m] ever welling forth freshly from its source (cf. Is. 48^{1} Ps. $68^{27\,(2}$ —*Securely*] v.^{12}.—*Alone*] or *solitarily* (Mic. 7^{14} RV.); *i*. secluded from foes, isolation being regarded as the guarant[ee] of security. So elsewhere: see Jer. 49^{31} (‖ *abide securely* [R without care*], as here), Ps. $4^{9\,(8)}$ (render: "Thou makest

28. בטח] adv. accus., as 12^{10}: so בדד (32^{12}).—אל]=על: see 1 S. 17^{3} and cf. *Lex.* אל, *note* 2.—אף שמיו יערפו טל] אף, as Ps. $16^{6.\,7.\,8}$ 18^{49} $68^{9.\,17}$ 77 cf. on v.^{20}. ערף, as 32^{2}†.

Digitized by Google

dwell *solitarily*, in security"), Mic. 7^{14}; and cf. Jud. 18^{7}.—*Corn and wine* (תירוש)] see on 7^{13}.—*Dew*] dew is often heavy in Palestine (G. A. Smith, *Geogr.* p. 65: cf. Jud. $6^{37\text{-}40}$); and at seasons when rain is deficient, is important for the land; hence it is frequently alluded to in the OT. as a source of fertility (Gn. 27^{28} Pr. 19^{12} Hos. 14^{6}; 2 S. 1^{21} 1 K. 17^{1}).—**29.** There is none (v.[26]) like the God of Jeshurun; and so Israel holds a unique position among the nations.—*Saved*] *i.e.* victorious (Zech. 9^{9} Ps. 33^{16}): cf. *salvation* (i.e. *deliverance, victory*) Ex. 14^{13} 1 S. 11^{13} 19^{5} Pr. 21^{31} *al.*—*Shield*] of God, as Gn. 15^{1} Ps. $3^{4\,(3)}$ $18^{3.\,31\,(2.\,30)}$ 33^{20}, and elsewhere.—*The sword of thy dignity*] *i.e.* the sword which maintains thy dignity (v.[26]). Jehovah is to Israel both armour for protection, and a weapon for attack.—*Come cringing to thee*] properly *lie to thee*, i.e. *yield feigned obedience* (RV. *m.*), of the unwilling (and insincere) homage rendered—especially in the East—by the vanquished to the conqueror. So Ps. $18^{45\,(44)}$ 66^{3} 81^{16}.—*Tread upon their high places*] *i.e.* march over them in triumph; see on 32^{13}.

XXXIV. The narrative of Moses' death.—The death of Moses will naturally have been narrated by all the principal Pentateuchal sources; and accordingly it is not surprising that the present chapter should comprise elements derived from JE, D, and P. The analysis is in most cases sufficiently clear; the only uncertainty is in one or two places where the phraseology displays so little that is characteristic that it might have been used by any narrator.

To P belong—

V.[1] certainly *from the Steppes of Moab unto Nebo* (see 32^{49}: and note that *Steppes of Moab* is peculiar to P: *L.O.T.* p. 128, No. 50); and probably *that is fronting Jericho* as well (see on 32^{49}).

V[7a] to *when he died* (note the exact conformity of the sentence with Nu. 33^{39}; also with the other similarly constructed sentences Gn. 12^{4} 16^{16} 17^{24} 21^{5} 25^{26} 41^{46} 50^{26} Ex. 7^{7},—all P); perhaps also v.[7b].

V.[8-9] (in v.[8a] notice "the Steppes of Moab," and the great similarity in form of Nu. 20^{29b}: v.[9a] points back directly to P's account of the institution of Joshua, Nu. $27^{18b.\,23a}$; v.[9b] to Nu. 27^{20} ישמעו; and with *And they did according as Jehovah commanded Moses*, comp. Lev. 8^{4} 16^{34b} Nu. 20^{27} 27^{22} 31^{31},—all P).

Probably also v.[5 end] "at the command of Jehovah" (see Nu. 33^{38a}, of Aaron; and note that על פ׳ is a standing expression of P's, *L.O.T.* p. 127, No. 41).

The rest of the chap. shows no signs of P's style. "The mention of *Pisgah* v.[1] (Nu. 21[20] 23[14]: also Dt. 3[27]), the phrasing of v.[4a] (which agrees verbally with Ex. 33[1b]), the characteristic expressions in v.[6.7b], and the affirmation, v.[10], of the fact that no prophet had since arisen in Israel whom Jehovah had known 'face to face' (see Ex. 33[11]; and cf. Nu. 12[7-8]), all point unmistakably to the prophetical narrative of JE" (Westphal, p. 46 f.). One or two expressions in v.[5.6a] are, however, possibly additions by D: and v.[11-12] (which abounds with Deut. phrases) is a supplement to v.[10], attached certainly by a Deuteronomic hand.

1. *From the Steppes of Moab* (עַרְבוֹת מוֹאָב)] Nu. 22[1] 26[3.63] 31[12] 33[48-50] 35[1] 36[13] Jos. 13[32]†. The term (which is used only by P) denotes the open plain, between Jordan and the mountains of Moab, into which the Jordan-valley expands immediately N. of the Dead Sea, now called the *Ghôr-es-Seisebān*, about 9 miles from N. to S., and 5–7 miles from E. to W. The corresponding plain on the W. side (about 8 miles from N. to S., by 6½ from E. to W.) is called the *Steppes of Jericho* (Jos. 4[13] 5[10] 2 K. 25[5] Jer. 39[5] 52[8]). The term is elsewhere used of a desert land (Is. 35[1] 51[3] *al.*), and seems to have been given to the region in question on account of its barren, unproductive soil: at least, the plain about Jericho (except the immediate environs of the city; see on v.[3]) has this character (Jos. *BJ.* iii. 10. 7 ἐρημίαν; Rob. *BR.* i. 542; *S. & P.* 296, 297; *PEF. Survey*, iii. 168),—the Ghôr-es-Seisebān, is, however, described as well watered, and covered with trees (Tristram, *Moab*, p. 349; *Land of Israel*, 513 f.).—*Went up*] Nebo would be more than 3500 ft. above the level of the Jordan-valley.—*Unto Mount Nebo, to the top* (or *head*) *of Pisgah, that is fronting Jericho*] a comparison of 3[27] with 32[49] shows that "Mount Nebo," and "the top (head) of Pisgah" are two alternative designations of the same spot—the one, perhaps, fixing it more precisely than the other—used by different writers: here they are combined,—probably by the final compiler of the Pent., who to the words of JE, "And Moses went up to the top (*or* head) of Pisgah" (cf. 3[27]; and in JE, Nu. 21[20] 23[14]), added the geographical definitions of P (cf. 32[49]). On the name *Pisgah*, see on 3[17].—*Fronting*] עַל פְּנֵי usually suggests *East of* (cf. on 11[29]): so *e.g.* Gn. 25[18] 1 K. 11[7].

The spot referred to can be fixed, at least approximately,

Digitized by Google

with tolerable confidence. The table-land (the *Mishor*, 3^{10}) or Moab, a plateau about 3000 ft. above the level of the sea, descends gradually to the Jordan-valley by a multitude of irregular mountain ridges and summits, intersected by numerous Wādys. Among these ridges there is one which "runs out west from the plateau, sinking gradually; at first a broad brown field of arable land, then a flat top, crowned by a ruined cairn, bearing the name *Nebā*": this is just 5 miles S.W. of Ḥeshbon, and 9½ miles due E. of the N.E. end of the Dead Sea; its height is 2643 ft. above the Mediterranean Sea, or 3935 ft. above the Dead Sea. West of Nebā, the ridge becomes narrower: at about a mile from Nebā are the ruins (Byzantine) of *Ṣiāghah*; and ½ a mile S.W. of this, the ridge terminates in a projecting spur called *Rās Ṣiāghah* (the head of Ṣiāghah), whence the slopes fall steeply on all sides down to the Jordan-valley, and the Dead Sea, 3586 ft. below (Conder, *Heth and Moab*,[3] p. 132 f.).* About a mile N. of these two heights, the ridge of which they form part slopes down into the picturesque Wādy ʿAyūn Mūsa, in which are the cascades mentioned on 3^{17}. This ridge is stated to bear indifferently the names of Nebā and Ṣiāghah. Nebā is doubtless the ancient Nĕbō. The name Pisgah has not been preserved. Presumably, it was the ancient name of the entire ridge. ראש הפסגה may be rendered either the *top* or the *head* of Pisgah; if ראש be *top*, the locality meant will have been the modern Nebā, the culminating point of the ridge; but in view of the fact that it is described in Nu. 21^{20} as *looking forth over Jeshimon* (whether this be the wilderness of Judah, or the long tract of barren land on the E. of Jordan, N. of the Dead Sea), it is more natural to understand it of the projecting headland at the W. extremity of the ridge, the Rās Ṣiāghah, which commands the better prospect of the Jordan-valley below.

From neither point is there much to be seen towards the E. and S., the high plateau of Moab behind, and the ridge of Maslubiyeh on the S., intercepting the view in those directions. But towards the N., W., and S.W., the panorama is superb,

* On Ṣiāghah, see further *Survey of E. Palestine*, pp. 154–156; and on Nebā, *ib.* pp. 198–203.

Digitized by Google

though the terms of Dt. 34^{1-3} are hyperbolical, and must be taken as including points filled in by the imagination, as well as those actually visible to the eye (see the notes). Actually the prospect embraces—on the N.E., the Belga (p. 52), a "waving ocean of corn and grass"; on the N. the undulating forests of the Southern half of Gileʿad, terminating in the Jebel ʿOsha (3650 ft. above the sea), behind es-Salṭ; the snow-clad top of Ḥermon; Tabor (in Zebulun); Rās Ibziḳ (Bezeḳ), S. of Gilboaʿ (in Issachar); ʿEbal and Gerizim, with the cleft between them indicating where Shechem lay; in front, as the eye moves Southwards, the heights of Benjamin and Judah with the Jordan-valley spread out beneath; the gap in the hills leading up from Jericho, with the height of Ḳarantania on the right; further off, on the horizon, the lofty peak of Neby Samwil, the ancient Miẓpeh (2935 ft.); next, the Mount of Olives, with the hill of Ẓion behind, and the ridge on which Bethleḥem and Ḥebron lie, stretching out to the left; in the valley below, the lower course of the Jordan, fringed with its growth of semi-tropical vegetation, the "pride of Jordan" (Jer. 12^5, $49^{19} = 50^{44}$, Zech. 11^3); the plain of es-Seisebān (East of the river), the old Abel Shiṭṭim, immediately beneath the spectator; opposite, the dusky, barren plain of Jericho, with the "rich green islets" of ʿAin es-Sulṭan and ʿAin Dûk, underneath the hill of Ḳarantaṅia; lastly, the Dead Sea, as far as ʿEngedi, stretched out like "a long strip of molten metal, with the sun mirrored on its surface," and bordered by the bare and stern limestone rocks forming the edge of the "Wilderness of Judah."*

And Jehovah showed him all the land, (even) *Gileʿad as far as Dan,* [2] *and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah as far as the hinder sea,* [3] *and the South, and the Round,* (even) *the plain of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, as far as Ẓoʿar*] "all the land" is the obj. of "showed," the following words, to the end of v.[3], defining the extent of land that is meant (RV. renders wrongly). The

* See further Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 526 f. (from the "lower Nebbeh," *i.e.* probably Ṣiāghah, cf. p. 524); *Moab*, pp. 325 f., 329 f.; Conder, *l.c.* pp. 134–139; G. A. Smith, *Geogr.* p. 563 f.

Digitized by Google

description begins with the N., and follows the eye round to the S. On Gileʿad, see on 3^{10}. The Dan meant can be only the well-known place of that name, formerly Leshem or Laish (Jos. 19^{47} Jud. 18^{29}), near the foot of Ḥermon, where one of the principal sources of the Jordan takes its rise, often mentioned as the extreme N. limit of Canaʿan (1 S. 3^{20} *al.*), now *Tell-el-Ḳāḍi*. Keil and others have supposed that another place of the same name in N. Gileʿad, mentioned also Gn. 14^{14} 2 S. 24^{6}, is intended; but the existence of such a Dan is extremely questionable (see Del. or Dillm. on Gn. 14^{14}; *DB.*[2] i. 703, 714: in 2 S. 24^{6} read, after 𝔊, "And they came to Dan, and from Dan they went round unto Ṣidon"); and the terms of the description here imply some well-known locality. The words "as far as (עד) Dan" do not mark the point to which the writer supposed Gileʿad to reach, but the point to which Moses' view extended. Dan is not, however, as a matter of fact, visible from Nebā (Conder, *l.c.* p. 139), nor, if Tristram (p. 527) be right, is more than a part (to Jebel ʿOsha) even of the Southern half (3^{10}) of Gileʿad; and hence Conder supposes that עד has the force of *towards*. But עד means distinctly *as far as*: no doubt the limit named is intended hyperbolically, and is not to be understood *au pied de la lettre*. Ḥermon being visible from Pisgah, Dan is probably named as the N. limit of Israel, near its foot.—**2.** *And all Naphtali*] the territory N. and N.N.W. of the sea of Gennesareth (on 33^{23}), reaching a little further N. than Dan. Mentioned as an important Northerly region of Canaan, the hills of which (many about 2500 ft. in height) might (to judge by the map) be discernible in dim outline from an eminence such as Pisgah.—*And all the land of Judah as far as the hinder sea*] *i.e.* the Mediterranean Sea (11^{24}). This again is not visible from Nebā (Conder, *l.c.*), the view being intercepted by the high central ground of Palestine. The same explanation must be adopted as in the case of Dan. —**3.** *The South*] the *Negeb*, or southern tract of Judah (Jos. 15^{21-32}); see on 1^{7} (p. 13).—*And the Round*] we should perhaps say the *Oval*. *Kikkār*, a *round* (often of a *round* loaf of bread, 1 S. 10^{3}, and of a talent, *i.e.* a *circular* leaden weight, Zech. 5^{7}), is used technically, as a geographical term, of the circular

Digitized by Google

(or oval) basin into which the Jordan-valley (the ʿArábah) expands, at about 25 miles north of the Dead Sea: so Gn. 13^{12} $19^{17.25.28.29}$ 2 S. 18^{23}, and "the Round of Jordan" Gn. $13^{10.11}$ 1 K. 7^{46} (= 2 Ch. 4^{17}): RV. "Plain" (with a capital P). 𝕲 here τὰ περίχωρα, in Gn. and 2 Ch. ἡ περίχωρος (cf. Mt. 3^{5}). See *S. & P.* pp. 284, 287, 488 f.—(Even) *the plain of Jericho*] not "of" (RV.); the words are in apposition to "the Round," and (with *as far as Ẓoʿar*) define its extent. The expression "Plain of Jericho" occurs only here; but בקעה, a broad "cleft," or plain between mountains (see on 8^{7}), would be quite suitably applied to the broad depressed plain in which Jericho lies.—*The city of palm-trees*] so (in appos. with *Jericho*) 2 Ch. 28^{15}; alone (as a name of the city) Jud. 1^{16} 3^{13}. Jericho was renowned in antiquity for its palm-groves. The site of the ancient city was, no doubt, close to the beautiful fountain ʿAin es-Sulṭan, or Elishaʿ's Spring, which gushes forth in a copious stream about a mile from the foot of the mountains which lead up into the high ground of Judah. At present the site is neglected, and haunted only by wandering Bedouins; but under cultivation it must have presented a very different appearance. Josephus seldom mentions Jericho, without praising the richness and productiveness of its soil. He calls it the most fertile tract of Judæa; and in speaking of the fountain says that it watered a tract 70 stadia long by 20 broad, covered with beautiful pleasure-gardens (παράδεισοι κάλλιστοί τε καὶ πυκνότατοι), and groves of palms of different species, besides many other choice and rare trees (*BJ.* iv. 8. 3, an eloquent description; cf. Rob. *BR.* i. 559).—*As far as Ẓoʿar*] the site of Ẓoʿar has been disputed.

In Roman and Mediæval times (cf. Jos. *BJ.* iv. 8. 4; Euseb. *Onom.* s.v. βαλα), a city called Zoara by the Greeks, and *Zughar* by the Arabs, at the S. end of the Dead Sea, was pointed to, as the Ẓoʿar of the OT.; and it has been located accordingly either (Rob. *BR.* ii. pp. 107, 518, and others) at Mezraa, at the mouth of the Wādy Kerak, on the isthmus of the peninsula *El-lisan*, or (Wetzstein, *ap.* Del. *Gen.*⁴ p. 564 ff.; Dillm.) in the Ghôr eṣ-Ṣāfia, at the S.E. end of the Dead Sea. The fact, however, that here and Gn. 13^{10} $19^{20.22.23}$ (cf. $14^{2.8}$) Ẓoʿar is alluded to as being in (or very near to) the *Kikkār* (see above) of Jordan, which was visible from the E. of Bethel (*ib.* 13^{10}, see v.³ 12^{8}),—as is actually the case with the lower course of the Jordan, though not with the S. half of the Dead Sea,—inclines

Digitized by Google

others to believe that it lay in reality somewhere at the *North* end of the Dead Sea: see G. Grove in *BD.*[1] (1863), *s.v.*; Tristram, *Moab*, pp. 330–334; Conder, *Heth and Moab*,[3] p. 154 f., who identifies it with Tell Shagûr, 6 miles N.E. of the Dead Sea, at the foot of the Moab range, near the Wādy Ḥesbān (though owning, p. 137, that this site is not distinguishable from Rās Ṣiāghah). The S. site is the more probable, and is now generally accepted (Hastings' *DB.* iii. 151): even the present passage implies that Ẓoʿar was some *distant* place, not one at Moses' foot.

4. *The land which I sware, &c.*] *verbatim* as Ex. 33^{1}. See on 1^{8}.—*Caused thee to see*] in the Heb., the same verb which is rendered "showed" in v.^{1}.—*Thou shalt not go over thither*] cf. 1^{37} 3^{27} $4^{21.\,22}$ (D); 32^{52} Nu. 20^{12} (P).—**5.** *Moses, the servant of Jehovah*] so often in the Deut. sections of Joshuaʿ ($1^{1.\,2.\,7.\,13.\,15}$ &c.): in Nu. $12^{7.\,8}$ (JE) Jehovah calls Moses "my servant." Also sometimes in later books: 1 K. $8^{53.\,56}$ 2 K. 21^{8} (Deut.) Mal. 3^{22} Ps. 105^{26} 1 Ch. 6^{34} 2 Ch. 1^{3} $24^{6.\,9}$ Neh. $1^{7.\,8}$ 9^{14} 10^{30} Dan. 9^{11}. Comp. Jud. 2^{8} וימת יהושע בן נון עבד יהוה.—*According to the command* (*mouth*) *of Jehovah*] so Nu. 33^{38} (P), of Aaron. *Mouth* in the sense of *command* is a common Hebrew idiom; and the phrase here used occurs frequently (in P) with reference to Jehovah (*e.g.* Nu. $3^{16.\,39}$ $4^{37.\,41}$ $9^{18.\,20.\,23}$): nevertheless, the Jews understood it here literally; 𝕿 paraphrases על נשיקת מימרא דיהוה; and hence the Rabb. legend that Moses died by the kiss of God.—**6.** *And he buried him*] though Heb. idiom (see phil. n. on 15^{2}) would permit the verb to be fairly represented in English by *they buried him* (𝕲 ἔθαψαν), or *he was buried* (see the RV. of 1 K. 13^{9} 2 K. 21^{26}—the same word as here—Is. 53^{9}), yet, in view of clause ^{b}, the subject intended is doubtless Jehovah.—*In the ravine . . . in front of Beth-Peʿor*] *i.e.* in the very ravine in which (according to 3^{29} 4^{46}) Israel at the moment was.

Probably the Wādy Ḥesbān (described in Tristram, *Moab*, p. 343 ff.): for this (to judge by the map in the *Survey of E. Palest.*: cf. also Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 525 f.; Tristram, p. 346 [remains in it of an ancient Roman road]) will have been the natural route for the ascent from Livias to Ḥeshbon, which, according to Euseb. (see note on 3^{29}), passed by Beth-peʿor (though the present road is a more circuitous one to the N.). Beth-peʿor, it is thus probable, overlooked the Wādy Ḥesbān, the "top of Peʿor" (Nu. 23^{28}) being an eminence on the hills above it. Cf. on 3^{29}; and see more fully the writer's art. BETH-PEOR in the *Encycl. Biblica*.

On apocryphal literature relating to the death of Moses, see Jude ^{9}, J.

Digitized by Google

E. Gerhard, *De sepult. Mosis*, 1667; J. A. Schmid, *De morte Mosis*, 1703 (cited by Dillm.); Ew. *Hist.* ii. 224, 226 f.; *PRE.*^{2} xii. 352 f.; Schürer, *N. Zg.*^{2} ii. 630–638 (where other literature is cited). The (incomplete) *Assumptio Mosis* was first published, in an Old Latin version, by Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana*, 1861, I. i. 55 ff.; Hilgenfeld retranslated it into Greek in his *Messias Judæorum* (1869), p. 437 ff.; the latest edition is Charles' *Assumption of Moses*, 1897: p. 106 ff. of this work contain the patristic quotations referring to the legend of the devil claiming the body of Moses from the Archangel Michael, on the ground that he had been guilty of the murder of the Egyptians, which was repelled by Michael in the words quoted in Jude ^{9}, ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι ὁ θεός. See also the פטירת של משה in Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrasch*, 1853, i. p. 115 ff.

7. *And Moses was an hundred and twenty years old when he died*] the age stated agrees with Dt. 31^{2}; it was, no doubt, traditional. The clause is derived from P (p. 417): it is the natural complement of Ex. 7^{7} Nu. 33^{39}.—*His eye was not dim* (Gn. 27^{1}), *neither had his freshness fled*] *freshness* (לֵחַ) occurs only here: but the cogn. adj. לַח means *moist*, *fresh*, of fruit (Nu. 6^{3}), or of growing or freshly-cut wood (Ez. 17^{24} Gn. 30^{37}), opp. יבשׁ *dry*. The natural moisture and freshness of his body was not reduced by age.—*Fled*] fig.; cf. of sleep (נדד) Gn. 31^{40} Est. 6^{1} Dan. $6^{19\,(18)}$. There is nothing distinctive in the phraseology of this clause; hence it is difficult to feel assured whether it belongs to JE, or whether, like cl. ^{a}, it is to be assigned to P. Wellh. (*Comp.* p. 118) is led by its terseness and force to refer it to J; but it connects so well with cl.^{a} that it may be part of P.—8–9. These two verses belong certainly to P.—*And the children of Israel wept for Moses in the Steppes of Moab* (v.^{1}) *thirty days*] cf. Nu. 20^{29} (P), of Aaron: "And all the house of Israel wept for Aaron thirty days."—9. *Was filled with the spirit of wisdom*] cf. Ex. 28^{3} (P).—*Wisdom*] *i.e.* practical, administrative ability.—*For Moses had laid his hands upon him*] see Nu. $27^{18.\,23}$ (P), which is here evidently referred to. The same ceremony (for different purposes) is also mentioned often besides in P (as Lev. 1^{4} Nu. $8^{10.\,12}$; nowhere else, except 2 Ch. 29^{23}).—*Hearkened unto him*] Nu.

XXXIV. 7. לֵחֹה] the older form of the suffix, retained regularly in Moabitish, but in Heb. (in our existing texts) only sporadically, 14 times in the Pent. (as Gn. 9^{21} 49^{11} Ex. $32^{17.\,25}$), some 40 times in other books (as Jer. $2^{3.\,21}$ $8^{6.\,10}$ 17^{24} 20^{7} 22^{18}). See *Samuel*, p. xxxv, and on 2 S. 2^{9} 21^{1}.

Digitized by Google

27^{20} "hearken" (RV. "obey").—**10.** *Arisen*] Ex. 1^{8} Jud. 2^{10}; also 2^{16} $3^{9.15}$ Dt. $18^{15.18}$, with which the present passage is not inconsistent, for "like" there expresses similarity, not equality. —*Whom Jehovah knew*] *i.e.* took notice of, deemed worthy of His self-revealing friendship and regard (Gn. 18^{19} Am. 3^{2}; 1 Cor. 8^{3}).—*Face to face*] in personal converse; so Ex. 33^{11} (E): cf. Nu. 12^{8} (פה אל פה); and on 5^{4}. The words denote the special pre-eminence of Moses among the prophets.—**11–12.** Two verses calling attention to Moses' pre-eminence in other respects, viz. on account of the wonders wrought by his instrumentality. The verses are attached loosely to v.^{10b}, and express really a new point of view. The phraseology is Deuteronomic; but their imperfect connexion with v.^{10} makes it improbable that they are the work of D; they are rather the work of a later (and inferior) Deut. writer, who sought to supplement v.^{10} by a notice of particulars in which it seemed to him to be deficient.—*As regards all the signs and wonders, &c.*] for the expressions used, see 4^{34} 6^{22} 7^{19} 11^{3} 26^{8} $29^{1(2)b}$. —**11.** *In the eyes of all Israel*] 31^{7}: cf. also $4^{34\,end}$ 6^{22} $29^{1(2)}$.

Additional Note on כִּפֶּר (21^{8} 32^{43}).

The note on 21^{8} was so worded as to give the general sense of this term, whether its primary meaning were assumed to be (from the Syriac) *to wipe, wipe off*, or (from the Arabic) *to cover*. Although, however, there are many passages in which the use of the word could be naturally explained upon the former supposition, there are others (esp. Gn. 32^{21}) in which this is hardly the case: the latter (which is also the usual explanation) must accordingly be deemed the more probable one. The various applications of the word are best explained in the note in Wellh. *Comp.* p. 335f. *Kipper* is *to cover*—never, however, in a purely literal sense (like כסה), but always *morally*, viz. with the collateral idea of either *conciliating* an offended person, or *screening* an offence or an offender. It is used in *three* applications. (1) Its most primary application appears in Gn. 32^{21}, where Jacob, in dread of Esau's anger, says אֲכַפְּרָה פניו במנחה I will *cover* his face with the present—*i.e. conciliate* him, the fig. being that of a person blinded by a gift (Ex. 23^{8} 1 S. 12^{3}) so as not to notice something (cf. Gn. 20^{16}). Hence (*face* being omitted) *kipper* acquires the gen. sense of *to conciliate, propitiate, appease*, the means employed (the כֹּפֶר) being, according to circumstances, a gift, an entreaty, conciliatory behaviour, and esp. (see 2) a sacrifice: so Ex. 32^{30} אולי אֲכַפְּרָה בעד חטאתכם (by intercession: v.$^{31f.}$), fig. Pr. 16^{14} (of a king's wrath) ואיש חכם יכפרנה, Is. 47^{11} (of calamity) לא תוכלי כפרה (|| שחרה *to charm it away*). The subst. *kopher*, lit. a *covering, i.e.* a *propitiatory gift*, is, however, restricted by usage to a gift

Digitized by Google

offered as an equivalent for a life that is claimed,—the *wergild* so rigorously prohibited by Hebrew law (above, p. 234) in the case of murder, but permitted in certain other cases, and evidently a familiar popular institution.* This sense of *kopher* illustrates 2 S. 21^{3}, where David says to the representatives of the murdered Gibe'onites וּבַמָּה אֲכַפֵּר wherewith shall I *make propitiation*? the satisfaction demanded being the lives of Saul's sons, who are thereupon sacrificed to appease Jehovah's anger (v.^{6}; cf. v.^{1} 24^{1}). See also Nu. 35^{33}, comp. with v.$^{31.32}$. (2) In the distinctively priestly phraseology (Ez. and P), the subject of *kipper* is the priest,‡ the means a sacrifice—usually the blood of the sin-offering, or the guilt-offering (אשם), occasionally the burnt-offering (Lev. 1^{4} 16^{24}), now and then something else:§ the object was perhaps orig. פני יהוה (cf. Gn. 32^{11}, and חלה פני יהוה), the verb being construed absolutely, *to perform a propitiatory rite*, with על (*on behalf of*) the person, less freq. with בעד (Lev. 9^{7} $16^{6.11.17.24}$ Ez. 45^{17}); but the use of the accus. of a material object (Lev. $16^{20.33}$ Ez. $43^{20.26}$ 45^{20}†) supports the view that the idea involved is *to cover up* (cf. כסה על, חתם בעד), *screen*, viz. *by a propitiatory rite*: there follows (if required) מן of the guilt from which one is freed (Lev. 4^{26} $5^{6.10}$ 16^{16} *al.*), or על (*on account of*), Lev. 4^{35} $5^{13.18}$. 𝕲 usually ἐξιλάσκομαι. See more fully on Lev. 4^{20}. (3) Sometimes *God* is the subject, who "covers"—*i.e. treats as covered, overlooks, pardons, condones*—either (*a*) the offender, or (*b*) the offence: so (*a*) Dt. 21^{8a} 32^{43} Ez. 16^{63} 2 Ch. 30^{18}; (*b*) Jer. 18^{23} Ps. 65^{4} 78^{38} 79^{9} Dan. 9^{24} (obj. in all עון or פשעים)†. God is also, no doubt, conceived as the implicit agent where the verb is *passive*: viz. Dt. 21^{8b} 1 S. 3^{14} (אם יתכפר עון בית עלי בזבח ובמנחה עד עולם), Is. 6^{7} וסר עונך חטאתך תְּכֻפָּר (the means a purging or atoning rite); Is. 22^{14} (means not specified); Is. 27^{9} Pr. 16^{6} בחסד ובאמת יְכֻפַּר עון (the means meritorious conduct): in all these cases, the subj. is the *iniquity*, which, when the verb is in the active voice, is the obj. in (3*b*), but never in (2). On Nu. 35^{33}, see above, No. 1, at the end.‖ In actual usage, the primary sense of *covering* was probably altogether forgotten. The connexion between the three applications may, perhaps, be best preserved by rendering in (1) and (2) *propitiate*, or *make propitiation*, and in (3) *deal propitiously with* (see more fully PROPITIATION in Hastings' *DB.*).

---

* *Kopher* is an interesting word, which carries us deep down into the feeling and usage of the ancient Hebrews. It is the price, or equivalent, of a *life*: Ex. 21^{30} (JE), 30^{12} P (a half-shekel to be paid by every one, at the time of a census, as the כפר נפשו), Nu. $35^{31.32}$ P (not to be accepted from a murderer), 1 S. 12^{3} (a bribe to screen a murderer: so Am. 5^{12}), Pr. 6^{35} (the injured husband will accept no כפר from an adulterer), 13^{8} 21^{18} (‖ תחת), Is. 43^{3} (‖ תחת), Ps. $49^{8(7)}$ (no man can ransom a brother from death, or give God a *kopher* for him); fig. of the discipline of suffering, Job 33^{24} 36^{18}†.

‡ Or sometimes the offering: Lev. 1^{4} 17^{11} Ex. $30^{15f.}$ Nu. 31^{50} 35^{33}.

§ See Ex. $30^{15.16}$ (the half-shekel paid at a census), Nu. 8^{19} (the Levites taken in lieu of the firstborn), $17^{11f.}$ ($16^{46f.}$) (Aaron with incense, quelling Jehovah's wrath), 25^{13} (Phineḥas, by slaying the offenders, and so arresting Jehovah's anger), 31^{50} (spoil offered on behalf of survivors in a campaign), 35^{33} (the blood of a murderer).

‖ Is. 28^{18} וְכֻפַּר is either simply *be effaced*, or an error for וְהֻפַר (see 24^{5}).

Digitized by Google

INDEX.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED, EDINBURGH

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

FEB 10 1996

SEP 10 1997

SEP 10 1997

P 10 1998

OCT 18 1998

Digitized by Google

BS491 .I6 v. 5 1902
A critical and exegetical commentar
Andover-Harvard
AGJ1223
3 2044 017 226 275

H

DRIVER, Samuel Rolles
A critical and exegetical commentary on Deuteronomy.

Digitized by Google